



# John Adams Library,



IN THE CUSTODY OF THE  
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY.



SHELF N°

ADAMS

130 4







---

THE  
POLITICAL WRITINGS  
OF  
O L D - S O U T H .

---

No. I.

ON THE BRITISH TREATY.

THE signature of *Old-South* may appear a little singular to those who are not acquainted with the proceedings of the town of Boston, assembled at this ancient edifice on the question of the treaty. At a previous meeting, the treaty was universally disapproved, and a petition forwarded to the President on the subject. It was therein declared to be injurious to the interest of the country, and destructive to our commerce. Many weighty objections were made to its ratification, and after the fullest investigation of the principles of the report, it was ordered to be sent to the President by the Selectmen.

About three weeks afterwards, a petition was handed about by particular individuals, to be signed by the citizens, urging our Representatives to make the necessary appropriations for the fulfilment of the treaty. This measure was considered as counteracting the former declaration of the town in their corporate capacity; and as undue means were used to obtain subscribers, another meeting was called to take the sense of the citizens on the subject. During the debates, the same objections were stated as at the former meeting, and the injurious consequences of this instrument were still held forth in opposition to its ratification, and appropriations. The pointed reflections then made on the opposers, are fresh in the minds of those who attended, and though the vote was carried against them, yet the consequent disadvantages we experi-

ence, are proofs of the propriety of the objections then offered. To commemorate this important era, the signature of *Old-Scuth* is now taken.

As the opposers of the treaty were at that period the objects of the most severe, and ungenerous abuse and censure; and as their principles were reprobated with all the venom of calumny and defamation, it is but proper to turn the minds of the citizens, into that channel of reflection, as will lead them to judge, "*Whether the sentiments of the opposers, or those of the advocates, were most congenial to the interests of the country* : Whether the predictions of the fallacy of British integrity, in protecting our commerce and respecting our neutrality; in their professions of friendship, and their cordiality to our seamen, have not in almost every instance been realized : And whether we have not proofs as clear as holy writ to vindicate the assertions then made, that the benefits anticipated by the treaty would soon become as delusive, as the " *baseless fabric of a vision*."

Let the orators who then pictured in the most glowing strains the blessings we were to enjoy under the mild operation of this instrument, now enumerate the manifold advantages we experience. Let them lay their finger on the document, which gives that ample indemnification to our merchants, for captured property, which they so pleasingly described. Let them relate the honorary marks of respect paid to the American flag. Let them contrast the late orders of the British government, with their rhapsody on British amity, and reciprocal attachments. Let them oppose the whippings, and insults to our seamen, with their pleasing recitals of good fellowship between British and American tars. Let them display the ports of Jamaica, New-Providence, &c. with the expanded wings of the American eagle, portrayed as covering the ocean in every quarter of the maritime globe. Or let them consolidate the blessings in the modest demands on the country for the payment of mercantile debts, and the execution of the unfortunate Robbins.—These are subjects, on which we wish to be informed, in order to judge with accuracy between the friends and opposers of the treaty.

The political controversy in this country has been carried on with a degree of personal inveteracy, unbecoming the character either of gentlemen or citizens. Particularly since the adoption of the treaty, every indecent term of reproach has been given to those

who were in the opposition. Disorganizers, traitors, enemies to their country, jacobins, are epithets which have been used against men, whose characters in every point of view have stood at least on a par with their calumniators, and in most instances superior. But we trust, however, that the time is fast approaching, when political merit will be duly appreciated ; as events will soon decide, how far the sentiments of individuals have been favorable or unfavorable to the happiness, interest, and independence of the country. Our political situation cannot long remain a speculative question ; it has arrived to that crisis, which must disclose the actions of men, and stamp on their measures the indelible marks of *right or wrong*, in characters too legible to be concealed, and too deeply engraved to be erased ; each individual will stand censured or approved, according to the part which he has taken, and judgment will be passed upon them, not under the influence of party spirit, but under that impression which arises from deliberation and reflection. This is the test to which every honest man is willing to submit his conduct, and though he may have borne the contumely of his enemies with a silent indignation, yet he must feel a consolation, that the period must soon arrive, when actions and principles, instead of calumny and reproach, will be admitted as the evidences of his integrity. Art and intrigue, threats and defamation, will no longer be wielded as the menacing weapons to deprive a tradesman of his employment ; nor the horrors of a distressed family be used as arguments to oblige a citizen to vote and act contrary to his sentiments. Thank God ! this day of political persecution is near over ; insolence begins to lower his crest, and though here and there we see its shadow, with some traits of its former arrogance, yet its fallow countenance bespeaks the feebleness of its future operations. With great propriety we can exclaim with the Prophet, as it applies to the circumstances of many, who grew fat and kicked, “ How has the gold become dim, and how has the most fine gold changed. Their prophets have prophesied *falsely*, and their *priests* bear rule by their means—and my people love to *have it so*, but what will ye do in the end thereof ?”

## No. II.

## ON THE BRITISH TREATY.

THE transactions of this town, on the subject of the treaty, were so unprecedented, that a mere relation of them at this distant period, cannot but carry conviction of the impropriety of our conduct.

Notwithstanding the *legal measure* originally adopted by the town, in bearing their testimony against the treaty, yet a number of persons formed themselves into a "self-created committee," and *early in the morning* patrolled the streets, and by unjustifiable means obtained a large number of subscribers, in favour of immediate appropriations being made to carry the same into operation. Instead of calling upon their fellow-citizens in a *legal town-meeting*, they took the advantage of the fears and apprehensions of individuals, and thereby increased their subscription-paper, not by the deliberate determination of the inhabitants, but by that *personal influence*, which their pre-eminent situation gave them over the judgment of those to whom they applied.

On a question so important, and on which the town had previously acted, it was incumbent on those gentlemen of the committee, to call another meeting of the inhabitants, that the subject might be candidly debated and maturely considered :—That the town in its *corporate capacity* might hear the arguments in favour, and in opposition to the measure :—That each man might be able to judge and act, according to the weight of reasoning offered on both sides :—That free discussion, instead of threats and menaces, should be the criterion on which the mind should decide. This mode of conduct would have been fair and candid, and no reflections could afterwards have been thrown on any one, whatever might have been the issue of the business. It would have shewn a disposition for reconciliation, and given an opportunity for each citizen to state his objections.

It may here be answered, that a town-meeting was called, and that the subject was debated in a legal assembly of the citizens.—But, after the committee had accomplished *their object*, by obtaining twelve or thirteen hundred subscribers, the public mind had by

this measure been so far *pre-engaged*, that it placed the business before the town, in a very different position, than if such a procedure had not taken place. After men had signed to a paper in favour of the treaty, it was too great a challenge on their pride, to expect that they would renounce in public, what they had thus done in private. This whole transaction was, if I may use the expression, *forestalled*, previous to the town-meeting being called; and the advocates for the treaty evidently felt their security in carrying their vote, from the peculiar conduct which they assumed on this occasion. The debates were carried on, with that *hauteur* of self-confidence, as fully evinced, that *they knew* what would be the final issue of the question. Clamour, and other indecencies, so far drowned the voice of the opposers of the treaty, that even the thunder of a Stentor, would have been as feeble in the tumult, as the whispers of an infant. From these circumstances, therefore, the town-meeting was rendered entirely useless, as it respected an *unbiassed investigation* of the subject on which they had assembled; and the whole transaction must, *on cool reflection*, be considered (as it relates to some) as the efforts of an overbearing party, to counteract, by undue means, the legal measures of the town at their previous meeting.

It may be observed by some, that it is unnecessary at this distance of time, to recount the doings of individuals on this occasion, as what they *then* did, cannot *now* be remedied. But, when we reflect, how far political characters have been estimated, by their opinions on this question; what abusive scurrility has been incessantly heaped upon those, who dared to speak their sentiments, —it may not be improper to mention these things, *by way of remembrance*, in order to shew, that however PARTY SPIRIT might at that period gain such an ascendancy, as to injure the reputation of individuals, yet, that the *event* has proved their opponents to be in the wrong. The apprehensions of the inutility of this instrument, and the distrust of its beneficial operation, were the principal causes which originated the opposition to its adoption. The venerable SAMUEL ADAMS declared in his speech to the legislature of Massachusetts, that “it was pregnant with evils;” and President WASHINGTON said also, that “it was pregnant with events.” The former with a prophetic spirit, dreaded its consequences, and the latter hesitated as to its salutary effects. Such were the cha-

rafters, that halted, and paused over this important instrument ; how ungenerous then has been the abuse which those have received, who expressed their doubts, when such sages were thus agitated ?

The present situation in which we are placed, is a strong evidence, that the benefits anticipated from the treaty are vain and delusive. The commissioners on the part of the United States have seceded from the claims of the British. This is a proof the demands must have been so unreasonable that Messrs. FITZSIMONS and SITGREAVES could not justify themselves in acceding to them. Notwithstanding these gentlemen were warm advocates in its favour, yet on an attempt to liquidate the system of settlement, they are obliged to relinquish the business. Notwithstanding the government have made all their necessary appropriations, and submitted the whole transaction to *the friends of the treaty*, yet when they come to act on the subject, the impropriety of the claims and the extent of the demands, are so glaringly improper, they are forced to suspend the negotiation. If these gentlemen are confounded (who are so favorably inclined towards the treaty) what must we think of the nature of the claims ? If they could not transact the business, who among us can expect to do it ? If the British commissioners will persist in opposition to these gentlemen, to whom will they condescend to comply ? The objections by these gentlemen must be of the greatest magnitude, otherwise *they would not venture* to derange and suspend so important a business. The treaty is now placed on their shoulders, as it has gone through every department of government, and it rests with them to bring it to a close. They must have strong reasons why they have seceded ; the property of the merchants is suspended on their decision ; millions now lay in the British courts, waiting the fulfilment of our treaty. Amidst such anxious expectations, our commissioners must be led by arguments the most cogent, to break off from this negotiation. We must conclude, when such men *hesitate*, that "the treaty is pregnant with evils," and that they dread its consequences. No small consideration could suffer them to delay a moment ; but to secede and disperse, carries in it an appearance of the most alarming nature ; or at least, in the words of General WASHINGTON, "it is pregnant with events."

What then, fellow-citizens, shall we say to these things ? After

every exertion made by its advocates—after Mr. PICKERING was so strenuous for its ratification, as to declare that all was “thrown into the wind,” if it was not effected—after the violent measures pursued to intimidate all who were in the opposition—after the “self-created committee” in Boston, had ransacked, *early in the morning*, every part of the town, and disturbed the pious citizens in their family devotions—after the abuse of Messrs. GALLATIN, LIVINGSTON and others, for presuming to offer a reason against it—after all the huzzas and exultation on succeeding in this business,—is it not strange that when it was left to Messrs. FITZSIMMONS and SITGREAVES, (two of its most strenuous advocates) the whole should be “thrown into the wind,” by them, and that they are the persons to discover its fallacy and deception?

This is a most curious circumstance. What must the “self-created committee” in Boston think of this? If they were so irritated at a few observations against the treaty, what must be their opinion of Messrs. SITGREAVES and FITZSIMMONS? These gentlemen have struck radically at the business; they have forgot your zeal in making the appropriations, and if one of the opposers had told you in town-meeting, that the treaty would be suspended in its operation, *by its friends*, you would have redoubled your clamours in hissing him from the *sanctum sanctorum* of the *Old South*.

Not to pursue, *for the present*, this subject any further, we cannot but flatter ourselves, that the characters of men will be duly appreciated, and that Congress in their next session will call on our commissioners *for the reasons* of their seceding. It is a question too interesting in its nature to be confined within the breasts of Messrs. FITZSIMMONS and SITGREAVES. If government have done their duty, and the “self-created committee” in Boston have done their duty, why is the business of the treaty suspended? The wisdom of the executive, aided by the resolution of the legislature, we trust, will reconcile these seeming contradictions.

### No. III.

#### ON THE DANGERS OF PASSIVE OBEDIENCE.

THE pride of every freeman must recoil at the disgraceful ways and means, taken by those who have the effrontery to claim the ex-

clusive title of federalists, to obtain proselytes to their measures ; and the infamous arts practised by the tools of this party, cannot but excite the detestation of every man, who duly estimates the character and dignity of an independent citizen.

Passive obedience, not only in principle, but in practice, is the test by which the patronage of these persons is to be gained ; and without the most humiliating subserviency to all their plans, no man is secure against the utmost extent of their persecution and destruction. Knowing the baseness of their views, they are afraid to trust to the deliberate and unbiassed judgment of the public, but depending altogether on deception, they take every method to check an investigation of their conduct, and by *terror* and *threats* accomplish those purposes, which otherwise would be stifled in embryo.

This is a picturesque description of a party, who have been assiduous in controlling the public mind. They have, for a number of years past, been active in bearing down every man, who dared to act or even think contrary to their opinion. Every vile calumny has been propagated against characters, whose independence of mind would not suffer themselves to become the dupes of a junto, whose only claim to be obeyed, consisted in the peremptory insolence of their demands, and the audacious arrogance with which they prosecuted their measures.

In a government like our own, it is but fair and reasonable that every citizen should be entitled to act and think independent of the influence of a "*self-created*" body of dictators. But unfortunately the times have produced a set of men, who presume to take a rank above the common level of the people, and because they have acquired, by speculation, usury, and other *accidental circumstances*, a larger proportion of property than many of their neighbours, they think they have a right to infringe on the privileges of those, whom they ignominiously designate as the *lower class* of the community.

This aristocratical junto cannot however obtain that reverence of character which they are aiming to acquire. The good sense of the citizens will ever appreciate their worth, as the means by which some of them have risen to their present elevation, are in so many instances derogatory to their reputation, that even the



brilliancy of their outside deportment, cannot conceal the blackness of their inward depravity.

For the most part, the measures of this *pretended* federal corps are matured within a "small party," emphatically styled the ESSEX JUNTO ; and after they have passed the ordeal of these *choice spirits*, are brought forward with as much solemnity as a young child to be christened. The plans thus adjusted by this primary assembly, are laid before another order, (promiscuously assembled in a well noted place of resort) for *their benediction*, and from thence are transmitted through various channels, consisting of runners, dependants, sycophants, and hirelings, till at length the whole superstructure rises into view, with as much facility as the machinery of an Harlequin exhibition. The different schemes adopted to effect their purposes are worthy notice : one man is threatened, and another coaxed—one is promised a *vast employment* in his business, while another is told that he will be deprived of *the little* he has already got—some are placed on the *visionary list* of preferment, and the high sounding titles of Colonel, Captain, Lieutenant, and Ensign, are sufficiently enchanting to secure a great number on this alluring prospect. Every wheel is set in motion, and even the insignificant, childish bauble of a *cockade*, is exhibited as a token of servile submission to all the dogmatical mandates, and gross impositions, which this supercilious junto are pleased to enjoin. No dependance however is to be placed on their assurances ; for, after they have answered their purposes, they leave their votaries a prey to chagrin and disappointment. Neither are they more faithful to each other, for if any accident, arising either from an unfortunate speculation or mercantile transaction, creates the least suspicion, they pursue each other with the most unrelenting severity.

Thus, during the controversy on the treaty, every artful means was practised to intimidate the honest tradesmen. Some of this party had the impudence to threaten an industrious citizen with a deprivation of his whole business. Every little contemptible art was practised to obtain signatures to many of their subscription papers. Boys in their *non-age*, and old men in their *dotage*, were forced to enrol their names, to swell the list of subscribers. They even deceived the President and Congress, in the number exhibited on their scroll ; for instead of free and independent citizens, a

great part were obliged to submit to the imposition, from an apprehension of a starving family, rather than from a disposition in favour of a paper the contents of which they held in the utmost abhorrence. The names of this Committee, (such as used unfair means to obtain signatures) ought to be known to the public, and read yearly in our town-meeting, to impress on the minds of the people the dangerous tendency of a self-created junto, in imposing on the fears of the citizens, and in attempting to deceive, by false representations, the constituted authorities of the United States.

The most virulent abuse was constantly offered in the papers under this influence, to all such persons as refused to comply with their arrogant requisition ; and every one was treated with the most pointed indignity, who *dared* to express a sentiment in opposition to their system of terror.

In justice, however, to a few who acted in this business, we are willing to exercise a candour, in believing they undertook it from the purest motives, though without maturely considering the importance of the subject. The difference between such characters, and the *high flying Terrorists*, is easily distinguishable, and charity draws a veil over their conduct. But, it may with truth be said, that in no instance, was the honour of the town, and the liberties of the citizens more grossly violated than in this transaction.

However unpleasing the recollection of past events may be, yet, when we reflect on the nature and tendency of such unjustifiable methods, to control the unwary and terrify the timid—how destructive to the unbiassed exercise of freedom and deliberation, when the middling classes of citizens are exposed to the personal application of men, whose *pecuniary influence* clogs every avenue of investigation—when poverty is made an argument to enforce a compliance with their demands, what more effectual system can be adopted to destroy that independent spirit, which is the basis of a republican government ? If this mode of conduct is permitted with impunity, instead of that dignified deportment, which ever characterises the tradesmen of this metropolis, we have reason to fear that this valuable body of citizens will soon be placed in that degraded situation, as to obliterate every trait of their former respectability.

Let us then, fellow-citizens, hereafter be jealous of these violators of our freedom, and watch with hawk-eyed penetration their future movements, lest, under the mask of EXCLUSIVE FEDERALISM,

they may substantiate a system which may give *them* cause of exultation, and *you* of grief, “at a future day.”

May heaven “infatuate and defeat their councils, abate their pride, assuage their malice, and confound their devices !”

## No. IV.

### MONARCHY AND REPUBLICANISM.

THE present contest in Europe is not merely as it respects France and the combined powers, but as it relates to the great principles of Monarchy and Republicanism throughout the world.—This has been openly avowed by the British ministry in the House of Commons. The restoration of the monarchy of France, and the subversion of their present republican government, are the objects contemplated by the British government in their present operations. It is therefore a *war of principle*, on the issue of which depends the happiness and freedom of mankind, as founded on this basis.

This being granted, we cannot but view with indignation the man who affects a total indifference as to the ultimate decision on so important a question. It has of late become very fashionable to reprobate both France and Britain, particularly among those who stile themselves *Moderates*. How often do we hear such characters exclaim, “*Let the contending powers fight on, it is of no consequence to America which of them proves victorious.*” This is a fatal mistake—it is of importance to the United States whether the principles of Monarchy should prevail over those of Republicanism, as the future prosperity of this country is involved in the controversy. If the republic of France should be subverted, can it be supposed that the republic of America would long survive the catastrophe ? If England conceives it necessary to exterminate in France a system of government founded on the basis of republicanism, is it probable they would view the same principles prevailing in America, without jealousy and distrust ? If they have involved themselves in a debt of millions to carry on a *monarchic crusade* in Europe, can we suppose they would set down quietly and observe with an eye of compla-

gency, the rising glory of the *American Republic*? If it is a war of principle, will they suffer the least spark of Republicanism to remain unextinguished; or rather, after having annihilated the flame in Europe, will they not exert their invigorated energies to obliterate every trait in America, which bears its image or superscription? Would the Monarch of France and the King of England ever be reconciled to the present establishment of *our government*, when the principles of our revolution had roused the subjects of the former to *dethrone his predecessor*, and obliged the latter to acknowledge our sovereignty and independence? Depend on it, AMERICA WILL BE VIEWED AS THE HOT-BED OF SEDITION, and the combined Monarchs would consider their work but half completed, while they suffered the seeds to flourish within the climate of the United States. The obligation under which Britain would lay France, (if Monarchy should again be restored) would ever make her subservient to the views of England, and the hatred of Britain would be prosecuted *against us*, with the additional weight of France to hasten our destruction. The power of the British government would be increased in proportion to the strength of France, and America would be obliged to stand alone in opposition to their combined efforts. France, instead of supporting our independence, would become an ally with Britain to annihilate it.

By observing the various publications in this country, during the European controversy, it is clear that many persons among ourselves have anticipated the *successes of the coalition* as introductory to a monarchical and aristocratical system in America. For these purposes the "Discourses on Davila" seem fully calculated. The pageantry of Royalty has been held up with a reverence, solely intended to recommend this form to our approbation. Numerous writers have openly advocated this mode of government, and many individuals, without hesitation, have avowed their sentiments in favor of its adoption. The newspapers under the direction of this party, have been more assiduous to propagate the successes of the combined powers, than even the Royal Gazette of London; and the observations which accompanied their "glorious news" were generally fraught with invectives against Republicanism and encomiums on Monarchy. It must be evident, by retracing the publications which have appeared within twelve months past, that the expectations of a certain junto in this country

were highly elated at the prospect of a total annihilation of Republicanism in Europe, and fondly anticipated its fall within the United States. Though some of them have not had the temerity to declare openly in favor of a *King and Nobility*, yet they have been desirous so to extend the powers of the Executive, and contract those of the Legislative, that the difference between the British government and our own would be only nominal.

From all these circumstances the conclusion is fairly drawn, that the principle of *Monarchy and Republicanism* is involved in the controversy between France and the combined powers. Where then is the *American* who can view with indifference the ultimate decision of so interesting a question? Can those who fought and bled to acquire those inestimable privileges, which are the basis of a Republican Constitution, behold with frigid apathy the contending armies in Europe, or express an unconcerned "*impartiality*" whether victory is more propitious to one side than to the other? Would it be pleasing to observe the standard of Monarchy erected on the ruins of the Bastille, and millions of unhappy victims falling sacrifices to the vengeance of an incensed despot, and a numerous body of enraged nobility and bloody priests? After contending against the combined exertions of nearly all Europe; after displaying the most brilliant exploits of heroism and bravery, against the mercenary banditti of British hirelings, is it possible that any *American* can feel a lukewarm indifference, whether the barbarous Suwarrow or the humane Bonaparte should reap the laurels of the controversy? whether Massena should grace the triumphs of this savage, or lead *him*, bound in chains, as a spectacle of horror and detestation?

Yes, fellow-citizens, there are some who call themselves *Americans*, who have anticipated the pleasing idea that Bonaparte would ere long be in irons, and Suwarrow drove in a triumphal car through the streets of Paris. How often have our papers been disgraced with eulogies on this beast of prey. Even the festive board has resounded in approving plaudits at the name of a monster, whose character is stained with the blood of helpless matrons and weeping infants. The ghosts of murdered innocents, it might have been expected on such occasions, would have stalked before the inhuman wretch who applauded this assassin, and dashed the glass from the trembling hand of him, who thus dared to pro-

fane their memory and smile over their tombs. But however discordant it may be to the feelings of the human heart, to observe even a bacchanalian in his cups giving such evidences of depravity, yet the pain is increased tenfold in observing the *fair daughters* of America admitting the name of this demoniac to designate any ornament of their attire. The *name* of SUWARROW, is more naturally attached to a DAGGER and a POIGNARD, than to a lady's head-dress. It may also be a desirable toast within a banditti of robbers; and the hall of Pandæmonium (during the carousals of the infernals) might with propriety resound with the name of a wretch, whose wickedness gives him a claim to dispute precedence even with BELZEBUB. Civilization is become too refined to venerate any circle, that admits this beast of prey among the characters they celebrate.

It is natural, fellow-citizens, that the enemies of our revolution should mourn at the victories of the French republic. The old spirit of '75 still corrodes their bosoms; and they yet feel that resentment against the *name of a Frenchman*, which boiled in their breasts when they were fighting with Washington against the armies of Britain. These men, would *then* have stabbed the immortal Washington with as much satisfaction as they would now sacrifice Bonaparte. *Monarchy* is their object, and whoever stands in the path which leads to the goal, must expect the utmost vengeance of their displeasure. Thank heaven, the snare is broken, and we have escaped!

## No. V.

### ON WASHINGTON'S LEGACY.

IT is remarkable, that the "legacy" (so called) of Gen. WASHINGTON, should be recommended to the perusal of the citizens, by those who act so contrary to the advice contained in that publication, and who advocate measures in direct opposition to the principles which he recommends.

The prominent features of this farewell Address, are conspicuous in three important points---1st, UNION of the States. This

is considered by him so essential that he thus expresses himself ; “ We have reason to distrust the patriotism of those, who in any quarter may endeavour to *weaken* its bands.” The second is, his disapprobation of MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS, which, he declares, “ under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as particularly hostile to *republican liberty*.” The 3d is, ECONOMY IN PUBLIC EXPENDITURES ; “ not throwing upon posterity the burthen which we ourselves ought to bear.” These are the cardinal points, on which our deceased friend emphatically places the happiness, prosperity, and independence of the United States.

In order, therefore, to shew the propriety of the *medium* through which the “ legacy of Gen. Washington ” is recommended, we are led to examine the sentiments inculcated by those, who now invoke the citizens to a consideration of the subject. For a number of years past, the writers in those papers have continued in one constant strain of invective against some of the most important States in the Union. Every term of reproach, every epithet of abhorrence, every species of calumny and detraction, have been heaped upon them. In many of those papers (especially in Connecticut) the question of separation between the Northern and Southern States has been seriously and vehemently agitated. The great coalition of the federal government has been indecently compared to “ a sow with a litter of pigs,” and the sovereignty of each individual State has been considered as a MONSTER, which ought to be execrated. The people, in their elective capacity, have been burlesqued, as an uninformed, ignorant banditti, and their votes stigmatized with the odious appellation of “ dirty pieces of paper.” The subversion of our Constitution has been contemplated by an *Hereditary President and Senate*, and the UNION of the States has been threatened by propositions from men *high in office*, to alter the fundamental principles of the federal government. Sentiments of this nature have been industriously propagated by some, who now recommend to our perusal the Legacy of our deceased WASHINGTON ; and, while they pretend to revere his memory and follow his precepts, are endeavouring to accomplish measures to convulse and agonize the UNION of the American Confederation. How inconsistent then is the conduct of such persons, with the advice given in the address ?---This party have ever been desirous to seek shelter

under the wing of General Washington, and on all occasions are making an insidious use of his fame to accomplish their purposes. They pretend to be his friends; but while they affect a friendship for him, they are assiduous to counteract every beneficent system which he recommends. *Union of the States* was with him an object of the highest magnitude: but disunion, and even separation, would be the result of their projects. *He* considers the dignity of the States as harmonizing in their *individual capacity*; while those persons view them as a menial group, descriptive only by the sordid simile of a "litter of pigs." Can such people be considered in unison with Washington?

As a further proof of the disposition of this party, in opposition to the Union of the States, is the abuse we daily observe in particular papers offered to the states of Pennsylvania, Virginia and Kentucky. The indecent reflections so constantly bestowed on them, *for an exercise of their own sovereignty*, are calculated to engender a spirit of animosity, highly prejudicial to that "Union" recommended by General Washington. Can the spirit of patriotism influence those, who are endeavouring to excite the most malignant passions and thereby raise a jealousy and distrust between the respective states?—Such persons have had the audacity to stigmatize the majority of the people of those governments, as disorganizers, enemies to order, and a banditti of unprincipled foreigners. This kind of language is solely calculated, to destroy every principle of cordiality, and, no doubt, is intended by a British faction to dissolve that amity so essential to the happiness and prosperity of the United States. Governor M'Kean and Governor Monroe, have been treated with the utmost scurrility; every infamous epithet has been used, to injure and depreciate their reputation. These respectable States have been held up as the hot-bed of sedition, and we daily see the grossest reflections upon the civil and moral character of their supreme magistrates.—What can be the result of all this virulence and defamation? Will it not bring on public and private animosity? Will it not weaken that "UNION," which General Washington considers as the bands of our strength and security?—We must certainly admit these States to equal rights with ourselves; how irritating then must it be to the citizens, to find themselves calumniated as the most detestable of mankind, because they have chosen to exercise their privileges in



the choice of a Governor? We have never found them *cenfuring us* for our choice; and none but those, who constitute a *disorganizing party* (falsely styling themselves federalists) would now have the effrontery to propagate their indecencies, unless with a view, to effect the wicked and detestable purposes of dissolving the Union, and counteracting the object, so seriously contemplated in the legacy of the beloved Washington.

Fellow-Citizens—in all my former publications, I have endeavoured to lay before you *FACTS*, in order that you may draw fair conclusions. Imposition has too long been a weapon, successfully wielded by those, who are emphatically designated as *a faction*, acting under the immediate control of a Junto. Such persons are now shedding their crocodile tears over the tomb of Washington. They are lavish in their encomiums on his virtues and patriotism; they are recommending his legacy to be read so loud, as that those on the house top may hear it. But in order to try their *faith, by their works*, examine critically their conduct, and you will soon discover the hollow voice of dissimulation, and fraud. While Washington cries “UNION,” they are vociferous for *dissension*. While he endeavours to draw the bands of friendship closer, they are assiduous to dissolve every link which connects the federal chain. While Washington recommends peace at home, they are kindling the flame of intestine discord, and doing all in their power to create an animosity little short of a civil war, between the northern and southern States. The measures taken by them, may, sooner than we are aware, produce the dreaded evil. Can we expect that Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Kentucky will calmly observe the indignities offered to them? Will they bear with complacency the scurrilous language, and odious epithets, applied to their legal proceedings, in many of our papers? Will not such reiterated abuse serve to alienate every affectionate attachment, and in time produce that rancour of disposition, which threatens the most serious consequences? Such an event would be pleasing to this inveterate faction, as they view themselves reduced to the last stage of desperation; and, as they find that the European controversy is likely to terminate in favour of republicanism, their last resource is, to sow dissension between the respective States. Abuse and scurrility are their weapons of warfare, and screened by a hypocritical avow-

al of their attachment to the deceased Washington, they prowl like wolves in sheep's clothing, to take an advantage of every occurrence that arises. How many of these modern patriots, who now display their insignia of grief for the death of the hero of Mount Vernon, would, in the days of our revolutionary troubles, have rejoiced to see him agonizing on the heights of Bunker-Hill, and expiring in the arms of Warren?

Recapitulation and reflection are strong antidotes to their treachery.

Let us then, fellow-citizens, while reading the "Legacy of Washington," consider it as an instrument of denunciation against the arts and stratagems of these pretended eulogizers of his memory. They are attempting to make use of his name to destroy every republican principle which he advocated. They are desirous, under the appellation of Washington's friends, to unite us with that nation, in opposition to which, our lately departed hero, by the command of Congress, arrayed the armies of America.

If Britain had succeeded, the amiable citizen, whom we now deplore, instead of being respectably deposited on the shores of the Potomack, would have been elevated (in company with the proscribed Hancock and Adams) as an object of derision within the purlieus of Temple Bar. Let us contemplate his virtues at the *trying period of our revolution*, and let us impress this TRUTH on the RISING GENERATION, that the man who wishes to ally us with *Britain*, cannot be a friend to Washington. We never can esteem those, who aimed a dagger at his breast.

May the tomb of this beloved Patriot be sprinkled with the tears of the VIRTUOUS Americans, and may it never be polluted by those, who would willingly have shed his blood at the times which "TRIED MEN'S SOULS"!

The other points enumerated will be considered in future papers.

## No. VI.

### ON WASHINGTON'S LEGACY.

**ILLUSTRIOUS WASHINGTON!** the REPUBLICAN CITIZENS of *America* celebrate thy virtues, not in strains of hypocritical

adulation, nor in the humble attitude of venal sycophants, but we eulogize thy memory in those sublime accents of veneration which are becoming freemen, when commemorating the glorious actions of their departed patriots. While performing this duty, we do not call to our aid a group of menial flatterers, whose dissimulation cannot reflect any honour on thy character ; for as thou acquiredst thy reputation in the days which “ tried men’s souls,” and *in opposition to their malevolence*, we disown their perfidious friendship, and claim the *exclusive privilege* of expressing the agonies of our sorrow ; and with the solemnity of *real mourning* most sincerely weep over thy grave. When the enemies of the American revolution exultingly anticipated thy fall, and rejoiced at those disasters which like daggers goaded thy bosom ; when the faithful band of *American Soldiers*, in concert with the troops of an allied nation, were suffering those hardships and toils which peculiarly attended the American camp ; when our cities were in flames, and the distressed inhabitants drove from their dwellings ; when every face turned pale, and “ every man’s hand was upon his thigh ;” at these excruciating periods of public calamity, the citizens who now lament thy exit were anxiously solicitous for thy safety, and with fervent devotion offered up their prayers to heaven, for the consummation of *thy glory*, and the *peace, happiness* and INDEPENDENCE of our country. While thus extolling thy pre-eminent virtues, we cannot but entwine the laurel on thy brow, and tears of grief which now flow on this sorrowful occasion, are those spontaneous effusions of the heart, which will forever embalm thy memory, and transmit thy name in honourable remembrance to future generations.

I shall now, fellow-citizens, as proposed in my last, pursue the subject, by considering the other important point contained in the “ Legacy” of our deceased friend. “ **OVERGROWN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS** (he says) *under any form of government*, are inauspicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as **PARTICULARLY HOSTILE TO REPUBLICAN LIBERTY.**” The principles of General WASHINGTON on the various subjects enumerated in his address, are so diametrically opposed to the conduct of many who now recommend it to public perusal, that we candidly suppose they are convinced of their former error, and are now willing to make *an atonement* for their numberless faults, by becoming profelytes to his sentiments. Military establishments have often been advocated in

the very papers which now eulogize this performance. They have gone so far as to hold them essential to the security of Republican Liberty. How are we then lost in wonder, when this sage patriot is reprobating military establishments in the most pointed terms, to hear men, who pretend to extol his political talents, recommending for our adoption, such pernicious institutions?---His expressions are as strong as words can render them. He describes these establishments as inauspicious to every form of government, but emphatically declares them so to "REPUBLICAN LIBERTY." These were the sublime sentiments of our beloved WASHINGTON---sentiments which ought to be wrote in letters of gold, and placed in every public department of the federal and state governments---sentiments which do honour to the man who has filled the office of supreme executive in a free, sovereign, and independent Republic---sentiments which should be taught to our children, and become lessons within our colleges, academies, public schools, and every seminary of education. They are so sublime, that even our pulpits should resound with those pathetic strains. After this exalted declaration, where is the man who pretends to revere the precepts of WASHINGTON, or considers his address as the legacy of a dying friend, who can come forward in support of an establishment DENOUNCED by him, as subversive of the happiness and freedom of his country?

Illustrious shade! may thy warning voice be heard from thy grave, and may the fatal tendency of mercenary military establishments be as deeply impressed on our minds, as thy innumerable virtues are on the tablet of our hearts. And as thou obtainedst thy glorious and honorable reputation in *defence of a republican system of government*, in opposition to a monarchical, may the citizens of America ever express their confidence in thy friendship, and their gratitude for thy inflexibility, by deprecating establishments which you have expressly declared are "inauspicious to liberty."

The dreaded consequences of Standing Armies are too deeply impressed on the minds of our fellow citizens, to require the labours of declamation to enforce an abhorrence to their introduction. The wounds are scarcely closed which were inflicted by the soldiery of Britain, and the sighs of the widow, and the tears of the fatherless are still expressive of their baneful tendency during their residence in America. Hancock, Warren, Thatcher, &c. in

their orations on the fifth of March, have depicted the conflagrations, massacres, depredations, and violence committed in all ages by a mercenary military force, and have described it as a sure precursor to the extermination of every vestige which adorns and dignifies human nature in a state of society.----They declared "that it was the most successful engine ever wielded by tyrants, and that it was impossible the kings of England should acquire such exorbitant power, had they not a standing army to enforce their commands----and that, with the officers of this army, they had bribed men to sacrifice the rights of their country."----Such are the opinions of the patriots of our country; and yet we daily see in our public papers advocates for measures which tend to the introduction of this MONSTER, "whose support is plunder, whose nutriment is carnage, and whose pastime is to inflict human wretchedness." I ask you, my fellow-citizens, whose habitations have been consumed by the standing armies of George the 3d, and whose lives have been jeopardied by the mandates of an insulting leader of a still more infuriated band of soldiery, whether you can now view a military establishment with cordial complacency? I appeal to you, who have experienced "British generosity in nakedness and hunger," their freedom in guard-ships, "and their tenderness in stripes, and at the end of their sabres." Speak, fellow-citizens, such of you as felt the vengeance of this system of terror, and were anxiously solicitous for the event, while some *miserable refugees* were even hardening the heart of the British Pharaoh, and urging him during our revolutionary warfare, "to make peace with Americans only at the point of the bayonet." If there are any who favour the doctrine of standing armies, I will reply to them, not only in the words of WASHINGTON, "that they are inauspicious to liberty," but enforce even this cautionary sentiment in the language of the immortal WARREN, "Our fathers look from their celestial seats with smiling approbation on their sons, who boldly stand forth in the cause of freedom----but sternly frown upon the inhuman miscreant, who, to secure the *leaves and fishes* to himself, would breed a serpent to destroy his children." Principles are permanent, time cannot make that wrong which was originally right, and however an Essex faction, a self-created junto (falsely styling themselves federal), a Peter Porcupine, a group of mercenary editors, apostate whigs, and a remnant of old and young Tories

may wish for the establishment of a standing army, yet we trust, that the patriotism of the Legislative and Executive authorities of the United States will annihilate in embryo, every establishment which "is hostile to republican liberty." As friends to the beloved WASHINGTON, they will never render permanent those institutions, which, "*under any form of government,*" he declares to be "inauspicious to the rights of the citizens." While we read "*his Legacy,*" thus denouncing military establishments, every drum we hear beat, and every cannon we hear fired from a mercenary corps, we must consider as his voice speaking from his tomb, to check the evil from increasing. In addition to his authority, we can also quote the President of the United States, who in the rapturous strain of ejaculation, "thanked heaven that in America there was NO STANDING ARMY."

"What our enemies so ardently wish, must be our bane : what they dread must be its antidote."---Our enemies are desirous for a permanent military establishment, but Washington says nay, as it is destructive to *Republican Liberty*. HANCOCK, WARREN, and THACHER entered their solemn protest against the measure ; "from *small beginnings* (says the latter) and *under specious pretences*, princes will raise a standing military force, the most successful engine ever yet wielded by the hand of lawless domination." From such authorities, composed of worthies both in *Church and State*, we have reason to dread the MONSTER as "concealing a dagger," under whatever form he presents himself. Let us ever be aware, "that the tiger crouches before he leaps." Military establishments are too terrific to raise their broad crest on their first introduction, but they imperceptibly instil their poison, till at length they bring on the political ruin of mankind, as universal as the moral depravity by Satan in the garden of Eden. The advocates of the measure soothe us by saying, "we shall not surely die : " but depend upon it, if we partake of its pernicious fruit, we involve ourselves and posterity in remediless ruin.

## No. VII.

## ON WASHINGTON'S LEGACY.

**E**CONOMY in public Expenditures, is another strong trait in the advisory address of the departed Washington—"not throwing upon posterity the burthen which we ourselves ought to bear."

It has often been urged by the friends of monarchy, that a public debt is a public blessing. Upon this principle it has always been an object in this form of government, to encrease the patronage of the Executive, by creating an artificial species of property, and thereby establishing in the hands of a few, a strong monied interest in the community, which on all occasions stand ready to support every ministerial measure, however injurious to the general happiness of the people. This policy has been assiduously pursued by the British nation, and from the multiplicity of descriptive evidences of public debt, it has become a science so intricate in its various labyrinths, that a man in England is obliged to have recourse to a stock-jobbing negociator, to know the value of the respective denomination of funds. By this infamous practice, the value of property is as intricate, to be accurately ascertained, as a question in law, and a few sharpers within the stock exchange, (after practising a few legerdemain tricks under the appellation of bulls and bears,) settle the value of every species of paper currency throughout the kingdom. Neither is there any appeal from their decision; as a leading stockbroker is as peremptory in fixing the public estimation of 3 per cent. 6 per cent. consols, &c. as the Chief Judge of the Court of King's Bench in determining a judicial controversy. Every man in the kingdom, who holds any paper evidences of public debt, must submit to the arbitrary verdict of a licensed body of sharpers, who regularly assemble between the hours of one and three, to fix the value of hundreds of millions of property, dispersed over the whole nation in the possession of individuals. The system of finance has become so sublimated in England, that it is principally conducted under the control of the ministry. Stocks rise and fall as directed from the office of the Premier—when they are low, the ministry buy in, and when they are high, the ministry sell out. Consequently on

the report of bad news, the government take the advantage of the public distrust, and enable *their purchasers* to lay in a considerable stock, in order to furnish themselves with the means to prosecute measures to carry on their further projects. In short, the funds of England are nothing but a pantomimic exhibition—it is a kind of magic, which those behind the curtain are playing upon the credulity and fears of the people ; the *propria persone* are a band of chosen Israelites, the real descendants from the money-changers in Jerusalem, who of old were driven out of the Temple ; the British minister is the manager, and the whole scenery is under his direction ; the audience are a group of dupes, who view with amazement the dexterous workings of the machinery, and laugh and stare at the raree-shows which arise amidst the gambols of Harlequin, in the character of bank directors. Thus will they continue to amuse the public, till the drama closes, the curtain drops, and the whole farce concludes with *exeunt omnes* ; the play will be hissed, and the actors driven from the stage.

Notwithstanding this immense bubble originates from an imaginary property, created from a paper system (the *principal* of which is never contemplated to be paid), yet the taxes for the discharge of the interest are ponderous grievances, which fall annually with an increasing pressure upon the most industrious part of the people. The farmer, merchant, tradesman, manufacturer, and labourer are all subject to the heaviest impositions to maintain in idleness a set of stock jobbers, who (in league with the ministry) are contriving to increase the public debt by a sham appearance of voluntary loans. The pretended national resources in reality are nothing more than a body of usurious Jews and swindling stock-jobbers depositing in the treasury their old notes, and taking a new emission, with additional *douceurs*, in consideration for their *disinterested* patriotism. The riches of the British nation are entirely ideal, and the whole art of public credit consists in the ingenuity of the juggle in shifting the denomination of paper. The tricks on Tower-Hill, and those at the office of the exchequer, are nearly parallel ; as the man who swallows pins, ribbons, and fire-brands, to amuse the rabble and pick their pockets, accomplishes his wonderful projects equally as satisfactory to the gaping croud, as the Premier in creating new debts to pay old ones, or *raising* the national credit by the *sinking* fund.



Aware of this destructive and deceptive system, which involves a community in general distress, our deceased WASHINGTON impresses on the public mind the necessity of *economy*, "not throwing on posterity a burthen which we ourselves ought to bear." The debt of the United States, during our revolutionary war, unavoidably threw upon us a weight which requires a large proportion of our resources honorably to discharge. Even this burthen ought to be so far lessened, as not to bear too hard upon posterity. But the immense debts since contracted have become a ponderous load, which may hereafter involve future generations in perplexity and trouble. The system, adopted by the United States, has introduced a kind of financiering policy in a great degree similar to that practised in England. It was so managed, that the most undeserving citizens acquired the principal part of the property which originally belonged to the American veteran army. The intricacy of the system gave the whole advantage to a combined clan of harpies, and while the decrepid foldier was feebly halting from door to door, and exchanging his hard-earned notes for the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table, a set of sharpers sprang into existence, and by stratagem and deception at length resuscitated the expiring property from 2/6 to 20s. Though at the present period it may be proper to throw a veil over this part of our conduct, yet the immense debt since contracted, and the excessive expenses and official commissions attached to particular departments, come within the advice recommended by General Washington, "not to throw a burthen on posterity."

The amount of debt now existing, and for which funds must be established to discharge the interest, ought to be accurately laid before the public, in order that every citizen may know the real state of expenditures, and the resources from whence they are to be cancelled. This is an important subject for consideration. By this statement, we can judge of our ability to support a navy, and army. It may be flattering to our pride to talk of twenty or thirty ships of the line, and to contemplate a standing army; but, we should first sit down and COUNT THE COST, before we prosecute the measure. It may be pleasing to a number of families to have their children provided for in the army and navy. It may gratify the vanity of those, who, from indolence, are unwilling to labour in their occupation, to be clothed and fed by the public bounty.

Such persons may feel elated, when enjoying the luxuries of life at the expense of the community ; but the question naturally returns, Are we not, by prosecuting this system, counteracting the advice of Washington, “ by throwing upon posterity the burthen which we ourselves ought to bear” ? Would it be satisfactory to posterity, when they find the weight of taxes increasing, to be told that we had raised, during a time of peace and when the militia were in the most respectable situation, a standing body of troops ? Or would it be any apology if we should relate to them how many individuals, who had become destitute of other means of support, were clothed in fine linen and fared sumptuously every day ? These narrations may *now* be agreeable and pleasant to those who enjoy the blessings of such establishments ; but a heavy tax-bill, to pay the reckoning, would be viewed with an ill grace, and probably lead posterity to *censure* rather than *applaud* their predecessors. Posterity will be able to judge of men and measures through an accurate medium. Characters will be dignified, not with the false gloss of flattery, but upon the substantial ground of merit. How far the actions of men have been meritorious will at those periods fully appear, and the voice of sycophancy and venal adoration will be silenced by deliberate reflection and mature reason. Time is the ordeal through which all characters pass : though slow it is sure ; and the man, who places his fame within the page of history, must stand only as a *candidate*, till every part of his conduct has revolved round its axis.

The sublime sentiments of Washington, in his farewell address, by recommending “*union*” and “*economy*,” and reprobating “*military establishments*,” are evidences of paternal affection, which highly recommend him to the love and veneration of his fellow-citizens. HIS LEGACY, under these respective heads, contains such an ample field for the exercise of every patriotic virtue, that, while we reverence *his* character, we cannot but anathematize a faction who are endeavouring to *disunite* the States—are in favour of a *STANDING ARMY*—and, by their extravagance in all public expenditures, are desirous “*to throw a burthen on posterity*,” similar to the destructive system of taxation which hangs like a mill-stone round the necks of the unhappy Irish, and the industrious part of the British nation. May God Almighty impress on the minds of “the people” these important truths !

## No VIII.

## ON MR. AMES'S ORATION.

AS Washington is now consigned to the solemn mansions of the dead, with all those honours which his pre-eminent virtues demanded, and the public mind is restored to its primitive calmness and composure; even under this heavy dispensation of Providence, a few reflections on the Eulogies which have been pronounced on his character, it is presumed, will not be considered as unworthy notice.

The first which claims our attention is delivered by Mr. Ames. This gentleman was appointed by the *Legislature of Massachusetts*, "to commemorate the sublime virtues of that eminent defender, guardian, and father of his country, that benefactor of mankind, General George Washington." Before so respectable an audience, on so sublime and *extensive* a subject, and before a government which had so sensibly felt (during our revolutionary war) the salutary influence of his military prowess, we could not have expected that the Orator would have attempted to weaken the reputation of the Hero of Mount Vernon in the character of a foldier, by saying, that "great Generals have arisen in all ages of the world, and perhaps *most* in those of *despotism* and *darkness*---In times of *violence* and *convulsion*, they rise, by the force of the whirlwind, high enough to ride in it, and direct the storm---Like meteors, they glare in the black clouds with splendor, that, while it dazzles and *terrifies*, makes nothing visible, but the darkness." How far the Orator means to apply these sentiments to General Washington, when at the head of the American army, he has not chosen particularly to mention.

The following quotations, however, will shew how far Mr. Ames meant to eulogize the character of Washington, as commander in chief of the American army. After speaking of the *French revolution*, he says, "But it is only the influence of *that event* on America, and on the *measures of the President*, that belongs to my subject"---and while he speaks with the utmost indifference on the character of a "*great General*," he immediately extols him "as a *Chief Magistrate*, who appears like the pole star in a clear sky, to

direct the skilful statesman---*His Presidency* will form an epoch, and be distinguished as the *Age of Washington*." Mr. Ames from these observations, endeavours to lower the military character of Washington, and attempts to exhibit the brilliancy of his reputation in his *civil capacity*. But where is the American, who has the feelings of '75, that would wish to eclipse his glory and honour, during the trying period of our revolution ?

If this was not his intention, why does he introduce the disgusting idea, that, "in times of *violent convulsions*, and in ages of *despotism* and *darkness*, great Generals rise by the force of the whirlwind, high enough to ride in it, and direct the storm" ? Is this observation any way analogous to Washington ? Was it an age of "*despotism* and *darkness*," when the Americans were contending against Great-Britain for their rights and liberties ? Did Washington ride in the storm of "*violence* and *convulsion*"; or like a "meteor glare on the black clouds with a splendour, that while *he dazzled and terrified*, made nothing visible but *darkness* ? If he did not, why does Mr. Ames, in an Eulogy commemorating his sublime virtues as a "*General*," throw this dark picture into view, and exclaim with a peculiar rhapsody, "that however the *military fame* of Washington may excite the *wonder* of mankind, it is chiefly by his *civil magistracy* that *his example will instruct them* ?" Are then the sublime virtues of Washington, as displayed during the distressing periods of our revolution, to be so far undervalued, as only to excite the "*wonder of mankind* ;" while his *civil magistracy* "is held up as the only *example to instruct them* ?" In his military character, was he only to be "viewed as a dazzling, terrifying meteor ;" while his *civil conduct* was the medium through which "*his example was to instruct them* ?" Was not his "*example* instructing," when he led the American army through the various difficulties and perplexities with which they were surrounded ? Were not his firmness, intrepidity and patriotism worthy of *imitation*, while contending for the liberties of his fellow-citizens ? and was not his perseverance, amid the innumerable distresses he had to encounter, an *example to instruct us*, against the wiles and stratagems of Britain ? In this exalted station as *Commander in chief of the American army*, in *opposition to Britain*, the illustrious Washington appears pre-eminent ---while under the direction of a patriotic band of worthies, assembled in *Congress*, (when an Hancock presided, and a Samuel Adams

was a member) he shone conspicuous as the "defender of his country." In this character, Washington will ever receive the applause of the virtuous citizens, and they will reverence his name while the horrors of *British* tyranny are impressed on the minds of Americans. The tear of most grateful affection will be shed on the remembrance of his virtues at the times "which tried men's souls." The *republican Americans* recollect him in the field of battle, surrounded with the *myrmidons of Britain*. They view him, with his heroic (though *injured*) army, beset on all sides with *Britons, Hessians, and Tories*. They now recount his deeds of valour, and instruct their listening children in those "examples" which he set them to oppose the despotism and artful designs of their former foes. These are the strong traits which they will ever consider within *their plan* to dilate on his character.

Though it may be for the interest of some, to obliterate from the American page the *military fame* of Washington, yet every true American will consider him during our revolution, "like the pole star in the clear sky to direct the skilful statesman": Like a sun that dispelled the black clouds of *British Tyranny*, and with its lustre terrified every lurking knave, who was planning in darkness to destroy his country.

As a proof of the propriety of my observations, the orator even in his relation of the American war, passes over it with this slight remark :---That "neither the *object*, or limits of his plan, would permit him to dilate on the *military events* of the revolutionary war." The *object* of Mr. Ames was not (by his own confession) to distinguish *General Washington* in the glorious achievements of our revolution. The brilliancy of his character, in this situation, was not within the "plan" of his eulogy. The sublime virtues of Washington, which rivet him in the hearts of his fellow-citizens, during our contest with Britain, are so feebly impressed on the mind of Mr. Ames, that he seems to *apologize* for mentioning them, as being detached from the great "*OBJECT*" *he had* in commemorating his reputation. Is it possible, that such a pointed sarcasm could be delivered before the legislature of Massachusetts? The patriots, who, at those times, were in our *State legislature*, know too well the distressed state of our country. They remember with bleeding hearts, when *they* and *Washington* were mutually engaged in the violent conflict for America and liberty! could it *then* be

supposed, that within so few years, the virtues of this *great General* in his most distressed situation, would not be “within the *object* of a plan” contemplated by an orator chosen to eulogize his distinguished talents ?

What was the political character of Mr. Ames during our revolution, is not now a subject of investigation ; but this is certain, that every friend to England, would not consider it “an *object* within *their plan*” to exhibit the full lustre of Washington while at war with Britain. They would tread lightly over this ground, and though common modesty might lead them to speak of the revolution, yet they would traverse the path with as much velocity, as the duke of York while retrograding from his pursuers.

These observations are not intended to be uncandidly severe ; but the design of this eulogy is too strongly marked not to excite a jealousy, that the character of Washington, in his revolutionary capacity, was but a secondary “object” with the orator. Instead of dilating on this subject, he turns his oration into a philippic against the French revolution, and almost loses the hero of his panegyric, in his anathemas against that nation. A stranger would suppose, that he was appointed to calumniate the French, instead of eulogizing Washington ; for he declares, “his thoughts teem with a deep abhorrence of that revolution.” What connection had this subject with the character of Washington ? Or rather, how could a man presume to celebrate the virtues of Washington, who approved, by his letters to that government, of the “*rise and progress*” of their revolution---who styled them “*a wonderful people,*” “*a magnanimous nation*” ; while he himself openly professes the utmost abhorrence of their whole conduct ? If General Washington was right, Mr. Ames is wrong : for the former declared, in the most solemn manner, his approbation of the revolution, and requested to draw closer the bands of friendship ; while the latter, abhors with the utmost detestation every principle of it, and further says, that “it was hostile to all peace, or order in society.”

This however is a fact, that general Washington, in his letter to that government by Mr. Monroe, has eulogized the French revolution in its rise and progress, beyond any man that ever wrote or spoke on the subject. Judge then, fellow-citizens, between the opinion of General GEORGE WASHINGTON, late President of the United States (the splendour of whose name en-

lightens the world)---and, Fisher Ames, Esq. a practitioner of law.

The foregoing remarks are only as they respect principle, but the following quotation is a specimen of his composition :---

" *I do not know that I ought, but I am sure, that I do, prefer those republics to the dozing slavery of the modern Greece,*" &c. Here is a display of *egotism*, which a modest author ought to blush at. But an impropriety of composition is more excuseable than an impropriety of principle ; it is not, therefore, of any importance to try him in the crucible of criticism.

## No. IX.

### ON MR. AMES'S ORATION.

WASHINGTON ! thou illustrious shade ! pardon the attempt to arrest thy "*military fame*" from the aspersions of those, who presumptuously rank themselves among thy exclusive friends. The republican citizens retrace, with enthusiastic affection, those periods when thou and thy patriotic companions were encountering the hostile inroads of a host of Britons, and their sanguinary coadjutors—when every man's face turned pale, and every man's hand was on his thigh—when the flames of our conflagrated cities were ascending to Heaven, and "*garments roll'd in blood*" were displayed as the trophies of a desolating soldiery—when frantic mothers were bewailing the massacre of their children, and weeping daughters were assembled to mourn over the mangled corse of their expiring parents—when the citizens of Boston, Charlestown, &c. were drove from their habitations, and sought refuge from the persecution of a mercenary banditti—when the inhabitants of America were suffering under the severe tortures of *British inhumanity*, and their guard-ships were appropriated as the slaughter-house from whose "*bourne no prisoner returned.*" At this important crisis, how did we hail you as the "*defender of our country*" ! At thy name every heart leaped for joy, amid the most trying scenes of our revolution. With the highest transport, *the real sons of America now* enumerate the sublime virtues which accomplished the arduous work of AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE.

But, illustrious shade ! how would you have stood appalled, if, in those interesting periods, some prophetic voice had arrested you in the following accents :—Washington ! thy “ *military fame* MAY excite the *wonder of mankind*, but it is chiefly by thy *civil magistracy* that thine example *will instruct them*”—“ GREAT GENERALS have arisen in *all ages* of the world, and perhaps *most* in those of *despotism* and *darkness*”—“ In times of *convulsion* and *violence* they rise, by the force of the whirlwind, *high enough to ride in it*, and direct the storm—Like METEORS, they glare on the black clouds with splendour, that, while it dazzles and *terrifies*, makes nothing visible but *darkness*—The fame of heroes is indeed growing VULGAR : they multiply in every large war : they stand in history, and thicken in their ranks, almost as *undistinguished* as their own soldiers.”

On hearing such language, even if it had been spoken by the *Guardian Angel* of America, would you not have exclaimed :—Gracious God ! is it possible that my “ *military fame*” should be thus degraded ? After all the toils, dangers, and hardships which I have encountered, to establish the peace, liberty, and independence of my country—after quitting my happy domestic retreat on the summit of Mount Vernon—after all the wearisome nights which I experienced, during the long revolutionary conflict,—are all these sacrifices to be estimated at so low a rate as only to “ *excite the wonder of mankind* ?” Are the American army, and the host of “ *great Generals*” now contending with me in the cause of their country, to be considered “ *like METEORS*, which glare on the black clouds with splendour, and make nothing visible but *darkness* ?” *Can it be possible* that the “ *fame of these heroes* will grow *vulgar*” ; or “ *stand in history* almost as *undistinguished* as their soldiers ?”—This would have been the soliloquy of Washington, had he been called to contemplate a subject in which HE and HIS ARMY had been thus implicated.

It is probable, that Mr. Ames may think that this is too high-wrought a description of his oration. But, in considering this subject, I do not mean to take a latitude beyond what a fair construction of “ *his plan and design*” will admit. I do not however, in these observations, mean to draw “ *a picture, flat as the canvas*” ; or erect “ *a statue, cold as the marble on which it is represented*” ; neither “ *cold, alas,*” as *his eulogy* is expressive of the magnanimity and virtues of Washington. But as Mr. Ames's oration is extol-



led by some, who *were inimical to our revolution*, as the most exalted panegyric that has been delivered on the hero of Mount Vernon, it is proper to try the performance by that touchstone which affected the minds of the American citizens, "at the times which tried men's souls."

It must be acknowledged as a *conceded principle*, that when a man is eulogizing a hero, without signalizing one single achievement performed by him, but on the contrary brings into view such reflections as derogate from the most prominent station which the person sustained, instead of exalting, he lowers the reputation he pretends to commemorate. The character of Washington as a General, must be allowed to stand pre-eminently conspicuous; it therefore must be the highest absurdity in Mr. Ames, as an eulogist, to throw a veil over this part of his conduct, by comparing "great generals to a meteor," or that they make "nothing visible but the darkness." But the absurdity is ten-fold increased when he declares, that such "perhaps have arisen *most* in times of *despotism*." It behoves him then to point out a *greater general* than Washington. If he does not, we must conclude, that he means to insinuate that the American revolution was an age of *despotism*, and that the great generals engaged in it made nothing visible but their darkness.

However, not to dwell longer on this part of his oration, we will examine how far his eulogy goes towards exalting the character of Washington, on that point in which he is explicit. Mr. Ames recommends chiefly his *civil magistracy*, and particularly refers to the *French revolution*. It may be thought a redundancy, to mention again this part of his oration, but it is so material to shew the impropriety of his pretended eulogy, that I cannot but contrast a little further his *sentiments* on the French republic, with those of Washington---more especially as he recommends his example on *that event*, as worthy of imitation. The following sublime sentiments were penned by Washington, and under his own signature were sent to the National Convention, in the year 1796. So recent a display of fraternity must confound Mr. Ames, if he means to hold to his present declaration, "that the French revolution has been, *from the first*, hostile to all right and justice, to all peace and order in society, and that *its very existence* has been a state of war-

fare against the civilized world, and most of all against *free and orderly republics*." This is the *modest* opinion of Mr. Ames on the French revolution. Let us now see what were the sentiments of Washington on this nation thus reprobated by our orator. His letter to the president of the National Convention is fraught with the following affectionate declarations :---

" Born, sir, in a land of liberty ; having early learned its value ; having engaged in a *perilous conflict* to defend it ; having, in a word, devoted the best years of my life to secure it a *permanent establishment* in my own country : my anxious recollections, my *sympathetic feelings*, and my *best wishes*, are *irresistibly* excited, whensoever, in any country, I see an *oppressed nation* unfurl the banners of freedom. *But above all*, the events of the French revolution have produced the deepest solicitude, as well as the *highest admiration*. To call your nation *brave*, were to pronounce but common praise—WONDERFUL PEOPLE ! ages to come will read with astonishment the history of your *brilliant exploits*.

" In delivering to you these sentiments, I express not only *my own feelings*, BUT THOSE OF MY FELLOW-CITIZENS, in relation to the *commencement*, the *progress*, and the *issue* of the French revolution. And *they* will cordially join *with me* in purest wishes to the SUPREME BEING, that the citizens of OUR SISTER REPUBLIC, OUR MAGNANIMOUS ALLIES, may soon enjoy, in peace, that Liberty which they have purchased at so great a price, and all the happiness which liberty can bestow.

" I receive, sir, with lively sensibility the symbol of the triumphs and of the enfranchisement of your nation, the COLOURS OF FRANCE, which you have now presented to the United States. The transaction will be announced to Congress ; and the colours will be deposited with those archives of the United States, which are at once the *evidences*, and the *memorial* of their freedom and independence—*may they be perpetual !* and may the friendship of the two Republics *be commensurate with their existence !*"

Such are the strains in which Washington addresses the French Convention. Here, then, the contrast is striking : the mind of Mr. Ames teems with abhorrence, the soul of Washington expands with cordiality. " Horror gathers like a frost" round the heart of the former, whilst friendship drops like dew from the lips of the latter. Mr. Ames spurns them from his embraces as a crocodile,

but Washington enfolds them in his arms as a *sister republic*. One would tear afunder the flag of the Republic, while the other carefully deposits it within our choicest archives. Judge then, fellow-citizens, whether Mr. Ames is not an apostate from the man he means to eulogize.

A continuance of observations, on Mr. Ames's oration, may become tedious to my fellow-citizens ; but as he has, by some strange fatality, become the champion of what are falsely called *federal measures*, the importance annexed to his sentiments are no otherwise worthy attention than to strip from him a mask under which many have deceived the public. His oration might furnish materials for a volume, rather than a newspaper ; but, in my next, I shall confine myself to that apparent disaffection, which he shews towards the conduct of President Adams, in his late mission to France.

The many tropes, and figures, of "light-houses," "meteors," "stars," "black clouds," "giants," "whales," "caverns," "scorpions," "fire," "frost," "volcanoes," "whirlwinds," "pole stars," "milky way," &c. &c. are highly expressive of the immensity of his "teeming mind." He hatches metaphors like young chickens, and intersperses them into his performance with as much facility as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings.

## No. X.

### ON MR. AMES'S ORATION,

MR. Ames in his answer to the Legislature candidly confesses, "in submitting his performance to publication, he exposes its *imperfections*." If he was thus conscious to himself, that his oration would not bear the eye of criticism, it is remarkable that his diffidence had not excited a little more modesty, and dictated a language more congenial to the humiliation of his own feelings.

When an orator acknowledges "his extreme want of leisure, during the preparation" of his performance, it is reasonable to expect that a strain of caution and moderation would prevail in every paragraph ; more especially, when speaking before a deliberative body, consisting of the Executive and Legislative of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In the presence of so august an

assembly, sentiments, and even words should be weighed with the nicest accuracy, and particularly on a subject in which the sublime virtues of a Washington are the subjects for contemplation. It is but a poor excuse for a man to plead the "want of leisure," when he is honoured by the Legislature of a government to eulogize a character, "which is hung up in history as conspicuously as if it sparkled in one of the constellations of the sky."

However, not to press Mr. Ames too close on his apology, it seems that he did not feel quite so diffident as his answer to the Legislature implies. If he was apprehensive of "*its imperfections*," why did he wish, "not to be considered merely in the midst of the citizens of this town, or even of the state"? "In idea, he gathered round him the nations." "In the vast and venerable congregation of the patriots of all countries, and of all enlightened men." He further says: "I would, if I could, raise my voice, and speak to mankind in a strain worthy of my audience, and elevated as my subject." If Mr. Ames was conscious of "the imperfections" of his oration, why was he desirous to gather round him such an immense concourse? It is rather singular, that he should wish to expose his "*imperfections*" to all the world; to the whole congregation of patriots of all nations, and to all mankind: and this he was willing to do, "in a strain worthy of his audience, and elevated as his subject." As a friend to Mr. Ames, I cannot think he would be desirous to proclaim his "*imperfections*" so universally; but would rather suppose, that his apology to the Legislature arose from a conviction of the indecency of his remarks *after the delivery*, than from any previous reflections. It is probable, that some hint had been given him, as to the deficiency, both in the *composition* and *sentiment*; and his own ingenuity had suggested a palliative, in the hacknied apology of "want of leisure."

I should not be so particular in observing such minute parts of this oration, if the reputation of Mr. Ames had not have been held up by some as the *Demosthenes of America*. I believe the Grecian orator never presumed to address his fellow-citizens on the most sublime subjects, and then attempt to screen his defects by declaring his "want of leisure." Such kind of subterfuge might answer in common cases, and among idle school boys; but if the Athenian orator had been chosen by the Areopagus, to pronounce an eul-

logy on the most celebrated character of that age, he would not have suffered his literary fame to be tarnished, by admitting an "imperfection" on so important a subject; neither would he have suggested an idea, that "want of leisure" should be considered as an excuse for the numerous defects in his performance. Demosthenes would not have slumbered over the tomb of Washington. His mind would have been so deeply impressed with the sublimity of the subject, that even during his controversy with Eschines, he would have found leisure to commemorate the magnanimity of a hero like that of Mount Vernon.

But, if Mr. Ames *had not leisure* to celebrate the virtues of Washington, it appears he had full time to reprobate the French revolution:—"His mind teemed with a deep abhorrence of it." Instead of contemplating, in its utmost magnitude, the hero of his eulogy, his mind was absorbed in detestation of France. It is a pity he had not informed the Legislature of the state of his mind; and declined an acceptance of so important a duty. This would have been much more respectful than to apologize for the "*imperfections*" of his oration, or to crave an indulgence from the want of leisure.

I shall now, as was proposed in my last, endeavour to shew the apparent disaffection Mr. Ames expresses towards the late appointment of Commissioners to France. His violent paroxysms against the French revolution, and against the government of that country, are strong marks of an indecent censure on the President of the United States. To say the least, it was an indecent reflection on his attempt to restore harmony between the two Republics. The deluge of abuse heaped upon them, must have a tendency to widen the breach between France and America, more especially as this oration is published under the sanction of the Legislature of Massachusetts. What must be the opinion of the French government of our sincerity, when they find such a torrent of calumny thrown upon them, even at the time we are making overtures for accommodation? How can Mr. Ames justify his conduct, in thus stigmatizing with every epithet of odium, a nation with whom the President is in serious negotiation? While the President has declared that he had received the most satisfactory assurances of the disposition of the French government to receive our commissioners, is it not the highest arrogance in Mr. Ames, to reprobate

(in a *hasty performance*) the revolution, "as hostile to all right and justice, to all peace and order," and that "its very *existence* has been a state of warfare against the civilized world"? Does he mean to insinuate, that the President is desirous to renew a connection with a people thus destitute of every amiable qualification, and that he is only sporting with our future welfare in attempting a reconciliation? Such kind of language bespeaks a disrespect to the measures of the President, which is not becoming a man who, by special appointment, was pledging the sentiments of the Executive and Legislative of one of the largest states in the Union. By what authority did he presume to bring into view the nation of France, when the vote of the Senate and House of Representatives never contemplated such a subject? It was the most unparalleled effrontery in him, to take this opportunity to vent his invectives; and, under pretence of commemorating the virtues of Washington, to asperse a nation, within whose territory the President had just sent his commissioners. Must not this oration be considered as an insidious counterpart to the pacific system adopted by the President, and, in some degree, intended to defeat the purposes for which it originated? I would not be uncharitable towards Mr. Ames, but it is a fact, that the President has met with obstacles in the business of negotiation. A junto are opposed to him for this part of his conduct; and every base means is taken to thwart, and defeat an amicable termination of this embassy. A war faction are busy to increase the dissensions; to prevent a renewal of friendship and intercourse; to force the two Republics to open hostilities; to create a war with France, and to form an alliance with Britain. All the tools of this faction are industrious in their various departments to accomplish these purposes, and while some are employed to calumniate that nation by their writings, others are as equally industrious to disaffect the public mind by detraction and falsehoods. A war junto are now doubly active since the prospect brightens for amity and good fellowship between France and the United States. They are afraid that their schemes for a standing army, and other detestable plans which they had anticipated, will be frustrated; and, as such prospects decrease, they become more vigilant to effect their projects by fraud and stratagem. Such persons are totally inattentive to the interest of the merchant, farmer, or tradesman. They do not

consider the embarrassed state of our commerce, and the immense injury to our trade, by the present stoppage of intercourse with France : such commercial considerations do not attract their notice. The great object with them is to obtain a war establishment---and, under this patronage, to riot in luxury amid the general distress, and impoverishment of the country ; to live on the toils and fatigues of the industrious ; to increase the public burthens ; augment LAND-TAXES ; and, after throwing the community into convulsions, to employ a **STANDING ARMY** to force the people into a compliance with their arbitrary mandates. Such, for the most part, are the men opposed to Mr. Gerry, as governor of this Commonwealth ;---he is for *Peace*, but they are for *War*.

Such reflections are not imaginary, they appear too serious to be doubted. If this was not the case, why do we find particular persons so anxiously desirous to prevent an amicable negotiation with France ? Why do we find them using the most irritating and abusive language towards them at this important juncture ? If these persons were disposed for peace, is it probable they would study such numberless epithets to provoke the resentment and excite the jealousy of the French government ? Or would they embrace every opportunity to vent their malice and chagrin at the conduct of the President, for commencing the present negotiation ? Impossible, that men who were seriously in favour of peace, should in all their actions and conduct express so contrary a disposition.

The British faction are now reduced to their *ne plus ultra*. They know that the business between the two Republics is in a train for an amicable settlement. They are convinced if this should take place, that a British influence would be weakened in this country. The Old Tories, and men of monarchical principles, are pleased while the controversy subsists between France and the United States, and they exultingly anticipate the period when the swords of the Americans will be drawn against France, and their arms extended to embrace Britain.

Gracious heaven ! can there be men who call themselves citizens of the United States, still attached to a connection with Britain, and desirous of a war with France ? Let such persons read the cruelties of the British during our revolution—let them read the horrid massacres of their fellow citizens—let them revert to those

periods when Britons and Hessians were prowling through our defenceless towns, and marking their footsteps with the blood of the innocent inhabitants ; let them ask themselves this serious question, whether they can place any confidence in the friendship of a nation, which has pursued every system of terror to accomplish their purposes ? Ye advocates for England, talk no more about *Religion*----were not the sacred temples of the Almighty, appropriated by them to the vilest purposes ? Even the venerable sanctuary, where the pious Prince and Sewall wept over their audience, was converted to an equestrian theatre----where the saints assembled, there the unhallowed footsteps of a blasphemous banditti marked their outrageous depredations.

These remarks may appear foreign to *Observations on Mr. Ames's Oration*----but, when we observe a disposition in any man to counteract, by *indecent reflections on the French nation*, the amicable negotiation now pending, it naturally excites sentiments of the foregoing nature. If Mr. Ames was a friend to peace, would it not have been prudent to suppress the indignation of his mind with respect to France ? Why should he vent his calumny at this crisis, when every effort is making to close the breach which has unfortunately taken place ? If the President is willing to heal the wound, why should he apply any corrosive to irritate and inflame it ? Would a friend to the President attempt to open *new wounds*, when he is using measures to close the *old* ? Could we expect this from Mr. Ames, whose pathetic speech in Congress *against a war with Britain*, contrasted Indians, tomahawks, and scalping-knives, with peace, liberty, and safety ?

The observations made by a writer with the signature of "NEW SOUTH," I shall consider at "*my leisure*." They appear too trifling to draw me aside from a *few more observations* on Mr. Ames's oration ; after I have gone through, I shall clip the wings of this *new fledged* rara avis.

## No. XI.

### ON MR. AMES'S ORATION.

**A** Propriety of language, and a dignity of deportment, are two essential qualities of an orator. It is derogatory to a public speaker to



use opprobrious epithets, or to take an advantage, from the exclusive privilege of his situation, to abuse nations or even individuals. It discovers a sordid disposition to improve an opportunity (when interruption would be deemed an indecency) to calumniate those, who cannot answer for themselves ; and when a man arrogantly assumes this mode to vent his invectives, it displays a strong mark of the malignancy of his heart.

Mr. Ames, when placed within the *sanctum sanctorum* of the Old South, arrayed in his sable habiliments, felt that kind of security, which has too often been improved within the sacred desk, to advance principles, and enforce dogmas analogous to the feelings and personal resentment of the speaker. Thus elated, he knew that whatever he might say, would not expose him to an immediate explanation ; and, under this impression, he felt a confidence in wishing to “ gather round him the nations” ; and with a supercilious assurance, was anxious to “ raise his voice to a strain which could be heard by all mankind.”

But to check the flight of this enraptured enthusiast, let us suppose him placed within the *hearing of the army of France* ; would he dared to have vociferated “ that the French revolution has been, *from the first*, hostile to all right and justice, to all peace and order in society, and that its very *existence* has been a state of warfare against the civilized world” ? It is a disgrace for a person to say that *behind a man's back*, that he is afraid to say to *his face*. Mr. Ames, though vaunting in a pulpit that he wished to be “ heard by all mankind,” would have exhibited a strong description of the tremor of Belfhazzar, if Bonaparte had at that moment been announced, as one of his audience. On such an event, he would have been a curious phenomenon in the history of Quixotism, to observe the change between the bombastic fulminations of an orator, when he considered his antagonist at three thousand miles distance, and the placid strains of complacency when he expected to confront him on his descent from the rostrum.

Mr. Ames, in his reply to the Legislature, acknowledges his oration to be a *hasty performance*, and that he had not leisure to consider the subject ; from thence we are to conclude, that he thought but little about *what he was saying*, or *who he was abusing*. His oration was a kind of medical regimen, which served to evap-

orate the effusions of his "teeming mind"; and his epithets, tropes and figures, like mercurial pills, served the valuable purpose of *discharging* the spleen and chagrin which for a long time had laid indigested within him. As those humours are now *worked off*, we hope he feels more composed and tranquil.

The French revolution is a subject worthy the contemplation of a philosopher. It is an epoch, which no history can parallel, and when a political character presumes to speak upon it, he undervalues his reputation by bringing into view the 'musty documents' of historical tradition. Where is the history that keeps pace in analogy with its rapid progress? It outstrips every slow, tedious process of former examples, and stands pre-eminent among those wonders which at once confound and astonish mankind. Bonaparte, in comparison with Cæsar, Alexander, and the long list of military characters which swell the page of history, is like the sun in its meridian splendour diffusing its rays among the inferior planets of the natural system. Such men are only viewed at a distance, like the *Georgium Sidus*, through a telescope; but Bonaparte is a luminary which displays its radiance not only within its own orbit, but illumines the extensive hemispheres of Europe, Asia, and America. He stands a monument of the particular attention of heaven; for, amidst the immensity of dangers by which he has been surrounded, he has never received a wound to stop for a moment the career of his glory. He has suffered innumerable deaths by his enemies, but he has risen from the grave with a tenfold increase of military fame. If the crocodiles have swallowed him, they have been obliged to disgorge their luxurious repast with an additional retinue to proclaim his re-entrance into life, and with fresh laurels to adorn the brow of their engulphed hero.----The combined powers of Europe have alternately been obliged to submit to the invincibility of this "wonderful people"; and we may daily expect to hear that the Emperor, with his prowling beast of prey, Suwarrow, are suppliants for their mercy. Britain may possibly have the honour of being the last to acknowledge their sovereignty; but the energy of the present government will probably force her to a compliance, in order to prevent the inroads of a "*conservative power*" (directed by Bonaparte) to check the lawless domination of this tyrannical nation. The letter of *Consul Bonaparte* to the *King* may be the precursor of such an event.

The French revolution thus fears beyond the idle tittle-tattle of a few superficial, local politicians in this country. The short-sighted policy of a funding system---the menial sycophancy of a British alliance---the trifling considerations of pecuniary appointments, the paltry efforts of a self-created aristocracy in America, are all lost in the great plan of the French revolution. The expensive monarchical, aristocratical, and priestly modes of their former government are completely annihilated, or at least are placed in that direction as must eventually destroy the pernicious principles which for centuries have been the scourge of that nation. The government is now free from the voracious demands of *bankrupts*; who, in some republics, are considered as national paupers, to be provided for by commissions in the army and navy. The levee of a Queen was a greater burden to the people of France than the whole expenditure of their present civil establishment.

To judge of the French revolution, we must recur to their former situation under the monarchy: and when Mr. Ames talks about French jacobinism, "as inspiring a fanaticism that was intolerant and contagious," he ought to have brought into view the gloomy recesses of the BASTILE! the despotism and extravagance of the monarchy, and the the horrid impositions of the Popish hierarchy. This spirit of jacobinism, which he reprobates, was necessary to counteract the immense pressure upon the liberties and property of the citizens, and became the only efficacious medium to oppose the tyrannical measures of their former government.

This jacobinism was similar to the spirit which animated Washington, Hancock, Adams, and the host of patriots during the American revolution; and had Great-Britain accomplished her wicked purposes, these heroes would have been stigmatized as jacobins and suffered the penalty of rebels. The term *jacobin* is of modern coinage, but its real signification (as applied by those falsely styled federalists) is comprized in the *old-fashioned* word, REBEL. The tories would have been equally as industrious, during our revolution, to stamp the epithet *jacobin* upon Congress, the American army, with the arch-jacobin Washington at their head, as they now are to give this appellation to the leading characters in the French nation. The traitor Hutchinson, if the term jacobin had been then in vogue would have been constantly dinging in the ear of his Majesty, that "jacobinism had become in America rather a sect, than a

party" ; "inspiring a fanaticism that was equally intolerant and contagious." The English papers would have been constantly teeming with this opprobrious epithet. Lord North would have re-echoed in the British Parliament, "the contagion of the jacobin faction," and every conspicuous character in the United States would have been reprobated as the fomentor of insurrection, and promulgator of disorganizing principles.

Every attempt to restore the liberties of mankind, or to check the progress of arbitrary power, is now styled jacobinism. If the people of Ireland make any exertions to maintain their rights, or oppose the cruelties of a mercenary soldiery, they are marked out as the objects of ministerial vengeance under this designation. If the French people espouse their liberties, against the outrages of a monarchy, nobility, and priesthood, the weapons wielded in opposition to them are the prostituted epithets of disorganizers, anarchists, and jacobins.

If Mr. Ames means to be considered as the defender of the *old system* of France, under which the tortures of the Bastille were exercised---the extravagant expenditures of the crown---the vastalage of the citizens, under the impositions of a numerous body of nobility---and their ignorance arising from the absurdities introduced by a phalanx of voracious priests : If he is the advocate for these establishments, let him step forward in a manly avowal of his principles, rather than by an insidious reflection on those patriotic efforts which have been made to restore the equal rights of the citizens.

Mr. Ames, while reprobating France as pursuing a jacobinical system, has the audacity to assert, that the same destructive sentiments are prevailing in this country. *An opposition to the Federal Constitution* is generally defined to constitute the character of a jacobin. Upon this ground, I am willing to meet Mr. Ames ; and am ready to place the stigma upon that body of men, among whom the greatest attempts have been made to destroy those *republican principles*, on which this Constitution is founded.

From what quarter has a *standing army* been advocated ? From whence is it, that the economical system has been so far superseded, that the impost and excise have not been equal to the exigences of our government ? From whence have land taxes arisen---stamp duties---bank establishments---with a numerous train of ex-

expensive official appointments, which have encreased the national debt to its present magnitude? Who were the men in favour of a treaty, which will probably deceive the merchant, and expose the farmer to a demand of several millions? Who are now desirous to counteract the amicable negociation now pending in France? Are those the men whom Mr. Ames would designate as the friends to our *Republican Constitution*? or would he represent their opposers as a jacobin faction? Have not this *latter class* of citizens been constantly urging economical measures; and in all their proceedings, both in and out of Congress, have they not been assiduous to prevent the pernicious tendency of extravagant expenses? The debates in Congress are evidences of their exertions to maintain the *purity* of the Republican system, to restore the friendship of France, and a desire to retrench the expenditures of the government within the real abilities of the people to discharge them. I may venture to say, if these traits constitute a JACOBIN, that a large proportion of the *real citizens* are of this description.

But, to come closer towards Mr. Ames, as it relates to the *Constitution*, and the disposition of certain individuals to alter its *republican properties*, I would ask him (and he is *requested* to answer) whether he is not the author of the following remarks in Miss Hannah Adams's history of New-England? If he is, let the citizens judge who are the men, that are desirous to change the essential principles of the Federal Constitution.----Who are the men, that are anxious to subvert the state sovereignties, and to establish a complete consolidation----and provided jacobinism is defined to be, *an attempt to change our present Constitution*, the question is, whether men of this stamp are not deserving the obnoxious epithet.

The remarks, referred to, stand thus in page 496 of the above-mentioned history :----

“ The withholding of a *complete negative* from the President, the *interference of the Senate* in appointments to office, the *mode of their election by the respective states*, the want of *permanency* in that body, sufficient for their *self-preservation* against the paroxysm of sudden democratic intemperance which have generally denied to republics the enjoyment of both tranquillity and longevity, and ABOVE ALL, the discordant and seemingly *anarchical* conflict of national and *state sovereignties*, the imperium in imperio, are yet considered by many as deviations from a *correct political theory*.”

In this proposition, an "unchecked, unbalanced" President, and an hereditary Senate, are contemplated---an uncontrolled appointment of offices by the Executive, and an annihilation of the state governments, are all considered as essential to form a "correct political theory."---Can any man who advocates such a plan be styled a Federalist? Can he be called a friend to the existing Constitution? Are not all the *Republican* and *Federal* traits of our government exploded, should such amendments be introduced? Could a modest man presume to reprobate others for attempting to subvert the Constitution, if he himself proposed a change which struck so radically at its vital principles?

It has ever been the policy of monarchists and aristocrats to effect their purposes by certain cant terms, which they circulate with peculiar facility, as descriptive of their own sentiments and those of their opponents---*Federal* and *Anti-Federal* have been used by them with remarkable success to favour their designs. While such persons style themselves *Federalists*, they have in most instances been endeavouring to *consolidate*, not only the *Federal* government in the hands of the Executive, but have been equally anxious to annihilate the sovereignty of the respective States. Instead of calling themselves *Federalists*, they are more properly styled *Consolidationists*. The Anti-Federalists (so called) are in fact the *Real Federalists*, as they have on all occasions endeavoured to keep the powers of the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial, as separate as they are contemplated in the letter and spirit of the Constitution. Under the term *Federalism*, many projects have been accomplished, and armed with this deceptive appellation, these *real Anti-Federalists* have assumed the exclusive title of *supporters of the Federal Constitution*. They have so artfully played their tricks, that, like jugglers, they have thrown a mist over the public mind, solely calculated to mislead every man who is not aware of the deception.

But, fellow-citizens, the passage quoted from Miss Adams's history, came from a man who was "high in office," and calls himself a *Federalist*. How far it is consonant with those Republican principles maintained in our state Conventions, is left to the candid consideration of every impartial citizen. If such a system should be adopted, what features of the present Constitution would be preserved? It would be so radical a change, that scarce one vestige would remain of its present theory; and yet those very

persons who are trying to bring the *Federal Constitution* into this distorted form, have the effrontery to stigmatize their antagonists as *Jacobins*, and subverters of the existing government.

Upon the whole, while reviewing Mr. Ames's oration, it appears intended rather as a philippic on political characters both in France and America, than an Eulogy on *General Washington*. It carries an insidious reflection on the late conduct of the President---it is bombastic in diction, but "flat as the canvas" in sentiment---it is crowded with fiction, tropes, and figures, which are absurd in their application---it is scurrilous and abusive, and destitute of those essential qualities which constitute the scholar, or designate the politician.

## No. XII.

### A FEW CANDID REMARKS ON "NEW-SOUTH."

THE principal object contemplated in the observations on Mr. Ames's oration was, that it had more the appearance of a *philippic against France*, than an *Eulogy on Washington*. A writer who styles himself "*New-South*," has denied the position, and attempts to prove, by inserting a paragraph of about twenty lines, (from an oration of 31 pages,) that Mr. Ames had done full justice to the "*military character*" of Washington.

This author, however, has placed the controversy in so perplexed a point of view, before the public, that we are at a loss to know who or what he means to vindicate. He sets out in a violent passion to reprobate the idea, that Mr. Ames is deficient in respect to the Hero of Mount Vernon; but, like all other over-heated enthusiasts, he soon forgets his subject. He begins with *General WASHINGTON*, and ends with Lawyer Ames....he styles his oration as the "greatest effort of genius and talent"; and that even the "*bonied eloquence* of a Kirkland" is not to be compared with it. "The liquid periods of the counsellor," he says, "cannot fail of receiving the *homage of taste*." In the midst of his rhapsody, he leaves Washington "in the cold ground," and thus proceeds to eulogize the seraphic Ames: "His eloquence will form an epoch in our country, and be distinguished as the AGE OF AMES: Al-

*ready* it assumes its high place in the regions of *oratory* ; like the *milky way*, it whitens along its allotted portion of the hemisphere ; our future rhetoricians will survey, through the *telescope of biography*, the space where so many beauties blend their rays, and delight to separate them into groups and distinct figures. The first of speakers may safely consign his fame to this *monument of his powers*, for it will live among the remotest days of Columbian liberty and happiness, and mingle its author's mild glory with Washington's." The above is a specimen of the sublime, which would add laurels to the brow of a Sheridan.

It is a pity that *New-South* had not consulted with Mr. Ames, previous to his publication, in order that they might have agreed between themselves as to the subject of eulogy---for, as it now stands, they are so at variance that it is difficult to reconcile them. One says, that it is the "age of Washington" ; and the other, that it is the "age of Ames." One declares, that "two Washingtons cannot come in one age" ; and the other says, equally as peremptorily, that two exist at one period. *New-South* has taken the climax of Washington's character, and applied it to Mr. Ames. Instead of contemplating Washington, in the sublime regions of bliss and glory, we are led through the "*milky way*" to explore the ascent of Mr. Ames, "in *his* allotted portion of the hemisphere." We are called on to survey, through the telescope of biography, in the regions of oratory, a variety of beauties, rays, groups, and figures, while "the first of speakers consigns his fame to the *monument of his powers*, and mingles his mild glory with Washington's." I must plainly confess, that this sublime pathos soars vastly beyond my comprehension ; but suppose it is meant to convey an idea, that the splendour of Mr. Ames (after passing through the regions of the milky way) will so mingle itself with the glory of Washington that it will be difficult to distinguish them.

If this is the real meaning, *New-South* has in every particular taken all the exclusive honour conferred on Washington, and placed it on Mr. Ames. If HE thus mingles his glory with Washington, his name must be equally "hung up in history as conspicuously as if it sparkled in one of the constellations of the sky." When Mr. Ames pays the debt of nature, some orator "must pronounce for posterity, *now dumb*, that eulogium, which they will delight to echo ten ages hence, when *we are dumb*." HE also is seen "like a star to cheer,



to guide, and to save" ; HE also appears " like a *light-house*, that gleams upon the surrounding darkness with inextinguishable splendour."

In short, *New-South* has eulogized Mr. Ames, far beyond what this orator has expressed towards General Washington. Every trait of his character is depicted in the most pleasing colours, and displayed in the most melting strains. He does not bring into view, as analogous to any office he sustained, " volcanoes," " black clouds," " whirlwinds," &c. ; but the softest language is introduced, such as " honied eloquence," " liquid periods," and " milky way." While " great Generals, like meteors, dazzle and terrify," Mr. Ames shines with lustre in " the regions of oratory, and whitens along his allotted portion of the hemisphere." *New-South* exhibits the portrait of Washington " as flat as the canvas ;" while he soars among the stars with a " biographical telescope" in one hand, and the trumpet of fame in the other, descrying the rapid progress of Mr. Ames, and proclaiming his approach at " the MONUMENT OF HIS POWERS."

" *The monument of his powers*" ! This must be acknowledged as the utmost extent of human invention. To arrive at the spot where this monument is to be erected, he wafts Mr. Ames " through the regions of oratory" ; through " the milky way" ; through hemispheres unknown ; and, after hurrying him through such a variety of climates, and exalting him to such a point of elevation, he at length places him in that space of existence " where beauties blend their rays, and delight to separate in groups and figures" ! These are rhapsodies which bespeak the great mind, and a most luxuriant fancy ; and we cannot but follow in idea, the biographer, with his telescope, prowling through " the milky way," " whitening in his progress their allotted portions of the hemisphere." This is *bathos* ! !

It is not my intention to treat this subject too ludicrously, but as *New-South* has come forward in vindication of Mr. Ames, if he will accurately determine, whether it is the " age of Washington," or the age of Ames, I shall then be able to reply to his ingenious performance. But while the epoch hangs thus doubtful, it is needless to enter into the controversy ; and if he and Mr. Ames will settle this point between themselves, I shall readily pur-

sue an investigation of the subject. It is peculiarly unfortunate for *New-South* to stumble at the threshold ; for the fact is, he is more at variance with Mr. Ames, than he is with me ; and the dispute really lays between themselves. If Mr. Ames is right, in saying that “ this is the age of Washington,” certainly *New-South* is wrong, in saying that “ it is the age of Ames”—and so vice versa. As this is a very important point, in which I do not choose to meddle, I shall wait with the utmost patience, till I am informed how they have determined the question.—Till then, adieu.

### No. XIII.

#### ON LACO AND HIS SATELLITES.

*To the Author of “ The Jeffersoniad,” in the Centinel.*

THE mode in which I have handled this subject, may appear a little singular to you and your party ; but, before I close, I believe you will find, that the controversy is well understood, and a proper application will be made as to *your charges against Mr. Jefferson*. ---As you are considered as a branch from this detestable junto, I shall in some future numbers treat you with that *familiarity* which your officiousness deserves. The Essex junto have had such an exorbitant influence within the government of the United States for many years past, that it is necessary to appropriate a few publications to expose the secret designs and insidious views of this fraternity. In the first place, I believe it can be clearly proved that every embarrassment, under which the country labours, arises from them---that all the *virulence of parties* originated through this pestiferous medium---that all the *deception* which has been practised, including *tub plots, Ocean massacres, Illuminati, &c.* originated from this artful, self-aggrandizing faction. This junto have, from the first establishment of the Constitution, been active to effect their plans, and for this purpose have enlisted into their service a few *time-serving clergymen*, aided by a phalanx of sycophants, office seekers, and war contractors, and thus embodied have watched every favourable opportunity to forward their destructive projects.

The *upstart hirelings* of this junto have often been challenged to appear before the public with their real names ; but like assassins they have attempted to abuse the character of Mr. Jefferson in pri-

vate caucusses, and under the shade of evening have sculked within the walls of Vila's hall to vent their base insinuations against the MAN, whose pen displayed not only the *spirit* of America, but stamped a *literary fame* on her character. When such pusillanimous beings assume a licence, under the darkness of night, to vilify the LUMINARY OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE, they shrink into the same contempt, as if a *glow worm* should exhibit his taudry wings to eclipse the radiency of the sun in his meridian splendor.

Another insect, of the same description, has had the effrontery to talk about "making peace with France at the point of the bayonet." Such insignificant chatterers may be indulged with such hyperbole; for should France contend with this country, such lilliputians would escape their notice, as it would be degrading for Bonaparte to exhibit them on the point of his bayonet. A flea in the paw of a lion would be but a poor compliment to the heroism of the sovereign of the forest; an insect of this size would not arrest the notice of a man, who has contended over the Alps with the veterans of Austria.

During our controversy with France, we have had the bombastic effusions of warfare from those who would fly (should the contest become serious) to the utmost boundaries of creation, rather than confront the enemy in the field of battle; or if they should be met with, by *accident*, the magnanimity of the French soldiery would pass them in pursuit of an enemy worthy of their conquest.

To revert more particularly to the apparent cause of our difficulties with France, it is proper to observe, that the *British treaty* is the ostensible object of controversy. This instrument was in the first instance unanimously reprobated, and though Laco was at the first town-meeting in Boston, surrounded with his satellites, yet not a word escaped him or them in favour of its ratification. It was *unanimously* reprobated by the citizens, as injurious and ruinous to the commercial interest of the United States. Their silence can easily be accounted for, as the plan for adopting this British system had not, at that time, be matured by the *first consul* of this junto; his satellites were then waiting orders, and after they had received their peremptory mandates, instead of acting an honourable part to counteract the proceedings of the town, they held a *secret meeting*, and issued a *clandestine subscription-paper* among the unwary citizens, to request the necessary appropriations. Every insignificant tool

of the junto was set in motion, and the streets of Boston were beset in every corner by a sub-committee to intimidate the unsuspecting tradesman to give his signature in favour of a treaty which he had previously condemned in town-meeting, and which it is said throws a debt or *demand* of twenty-one millions of dollars upon the citizens of the United States. An instrument, which may be considered as the source of all our difficulties between England and France, as it furnishes the former with a plea to take our vessels, and the latter a plausible pretence to treat us with indignity.—During this transaction, many had the effrontery to threaten the industrious tradesman with the loss of business, in case he refused signing; some of them however might at that time have considered party zeal as *profitable*, while the arrogance of *others* admits of no apology. Mr. Hamilton, it is said, was the first man who had the boldness publicly to advocate the adoption of the treaty, and when his partizans found he was successful in New-York, they assumed their wonted courage in other parts of the United States, and at length by *threats* and *deception* gained over a large proportion of the citizens.

I am willing to allow, that many who were active on this occasion, are not, strictly speaking, of the Essex junto. But the boldness and audacity of these persons have deceived many honest, well-disposed individuals. The insolence, however, of those who threatened the tradesmen with loss of work, ought never to be forgiven, as it shews the depravity of their mind, and the baseness of their conduct—a *purse-proud wretch*, who by accident has risen vastly beyond his expectations, when he attempts to deprive a tradesman of his liberty, should be ever viewed with that indignation which his impudence and ignorance merit. Should the body of tradesmen be controlled by such *upstart lordlings*, they are unworthy the name of FREEMEN.

The British treaty was considered by the junto as the *ne plus ultra*; without this could be ratified, they knew that the controversy between France and America would be easily settled. Their plans were so deep, they found it necessary that an instrument of this baneful nature was essential to their purposes. They knew if they could entrap us with Britain, within the chains of a treaty, that it would give them an ascendancy in case any overtures should hereafter be made with France to settle existing difficulties.

They were well aware, that the articles of this compact, involved many important points, and should we attempt to make a treaty with France, that our *previous contracts with Britain* would embarrass us. All these particulars were understood by the junto, and therefore, after the ratification, every effort was made to irritate and calumniate the French. The English were held up as our only friends, and the French as the only nation against whom our resentment should be directed. Cockades were displayed as the counterfign of French extermination. A well known blusterer in Boston, under the patronage of this popular phrenzy, was inflated with a *temporary courage* to pull from the hat of an *invalid Frenchman* the tri-coloured cockade :—this *hero* felt an assurance, under the mania of the moment, to disgrace the town of Boston in suffering his insolence to go unpunished. Every indecency was offered to a citizen who had spirit and resolution to withstand the general outrage on private judgment. During the paroxysm of the public mind, the junto took courage to dencounce individuals. Many public papers were devoted to their service. They even had the impudence to mention who should be displaced from office ; and previous to the removal of Messrs. Gardner and Whipple of Portsmouth, the suggestion appeared in one of those papers.—During this public infatuation, and under the influence of the junto, how many respectable men were removed from office ? In the arrangement of the army, carried on by the Essex junto, how many veterans have been neglected ? and how many have been commissioned whose services are not known in the history of those times which “*tried men’s souls*” ? In short, under the guidance of a junto, it is suspected the American government has been thrown into the most distorted position. The enemies of our revolution have in many instances risen to the highest degree of eminence, while the old soldier has been left to console himself with the prospect of better times. How many red plumes have been displayed in the hats of those who have no claim on our affection or gratitude !

This junto, we hope, has progressed to its utmost latitude. The President has at length found out their nefarious designs. He begins to discountenance their plans, and we trust is desirous to begin a system upon those principles which immortalized the “*proscribed patriots, Adams and Hancock.*” We trust in God, the designs of the Essex junto are too well known for them ever

again to renew their iniquitous measures, and while we commiserate the MAN who has been deceived by their mischievous designs, we cannot but revere the political character of Mr. Jefferson, who was never duped by them. He always was aware of their intentions, and has *uniformly* been opposed to their measures. He rose superior to their plans, and has not now the mortification to acknowledge that he was in any instance influenced by them.---Happy would it have been for this country, if every man had been as discerning to avoid the machinations of a junto, who have brought this country to the brink of ruin. He who foresees evil, is worthy the confidence of an enlightened people.

---

## No. XIV.

## WHIG AND TORY.

*To the Author of "The Jeffersoniad," in the Centinel.*

AS you are but a "twig of the branch," sprouting from the root of the ESSEX JUNTO, and trying to recommend yourself to the notice of this detestable fraternity by abuse and scurrility, it is proper to give you a trait of those characters which are designated under this appellation. Your folly and ignorance are exhibited in such glowing colours, that it appears cruel to add to the deformity of your portrait, by displaying to the public the real characters of those, under whose patronage you are calumniating the patriotic Jefferson. A virtuous deist is preferable to a man who *professes Christianity* and violates its principles. Mr. Jefferson has endeavoured to emancipate the citizens of Virginia from the thralldom of a religious test ; to give to Baptists, Quakers, and every other sect, the freedom of conscience ;---and, whilst they act conformable to the Constitution and the laws, their tenets, he candidly supposes, will not "pick our pockets, nor break our legs." This doctrine is agreeable to the principles of the Federal Constitution, and to those of a large majority of the States.

At this enlightened period, when the dogmas of illiberal zealots are so universally reprobated, it is disgraceful for the people of the United States to censure the catholic sentiments of Mr. Jefferson ;

or to hold him up as an object of reproach, for endeavouring to check the violence of religious persecution. As it relates to the oppressive laws of Virginia, at the time he wrote his observations, Mr. Jefferson stands in the same point of view as Luther in opposition to the tyranny of the Church of Rome----as Barclay, in vindication of the Quakers----as Mayhew and Chauncy, in vindicating the Dissenters----as Backus, Stillman, Baldwin, &c. in support of the privileges of the Baptists. In short, he is the vindicator of the rights of conscience, in opposition to all those baneful Tests which have been imposed on mankind. Instead of being stigmatized with the epithets of Atheist, and Deist, he is entitled to the respect of every citizen, let his *religious opinions* be what they may ; and he has, as fully, and faithfully declared the *rights of conscience*, as he has the justness of AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE. He ever ought to be equally revered, by all religious sectaries, for his *catholicism*, as he is by the friends of the American revolution for his REPUBLICANISM. The baseness of a junto, in abusing this man, is the strongest evidence of their villany.

I shall now proceed by observing, that the Essex Junto always had a peculiar faculty in connecting *names* with *things*. During the witchcraft influence, every person selected for public vengeance by the junto, was hunted down under the appellation of *witch*. The WIZARDS of that day were as assiduous to raise a popular clamour against an innocent old woman, as they now are to excite an indignation against all those who are opposed to their political conspiracies. The term *jacobin*, they foolishly think, is as favourable to their political projects, as that of *witch* was to their religious fanaticism. The baseness of their designs never could depend on an investigation of principles ; but they always took sanctuary under certain words, which operated like magic to effect their diabolical purposes. If Laco had been on the stage, in the time of witchcraft, his demure deportment, and monkish austerity would have qualified him for the grand Sanhedrim of judicial inquiry ; and if a faltering old woman had been affrighted in his presence, or thrown into hysterics by his disgusting countenance, he would have thought it the highest display of his official integrity to condemn her to the stake, or the gallows, for her convulsions.

Your frequently using the word *jacobin*, in your publications, is a clear evidence that you belong to that ignominious party, emphatically styled the Essex Junto, or more properly *an American British faction*---For this fraternity does not solely reside in Essex, but it is a poisonous weed which has propagated itself throughout the United States. The *root* is planted in New-York, and the branches overspread America, and contaminate by their pestiferous exhalations a few individuals in every city and town throughout the Union.

What a glorious harvest ! America in controversy with France ! In controversy with a nation, who assisted us when oppressed by Britain ; who lent us money, when our troops were naked and famished for want of this necessary aid ; who sent her fleet, and reinforced our army with her veterans ; who are now acting over the same tragedy in recovering their liberties, as was displayed on the heights of Bunker.

What a glorious harvest ! In controversy with France, while Britain is still pursuing a system of depredation on our commerce ; when their islands are thronged with American prizes ; when the Thames is crowded with British captures ; when their judges are condemning the hard-earned property of American citizens ; when our seamen are impressed on board their navy. During this violation of our neutral rights, how surprising is it that we have a junto who are advocating British lenity ! apologizing for their enormities, and opposed to a reconciliation with France.

Yes, fellow-citizens, we have such a faction in the bosom of our country : Men who are the supporters of Britain during their violation of our rights, and the plunder of our property. Their insidious measures have entrapped us into the wily machinations of our implacable foes. An enemy hath done this, and this enemy is no other than a **FACTION**, "crouching like tygers before they leap."

In order, therefore, to designate the party, let us henceforth use the old appropriate terms, **WHIG** and **TORY**.---The **WHIGS** are those who have long seen, and deprecated the influence obtained in this country, through the operation of certain leading characters. They have been styled *jacobins*, but they are the real supporters of the Federal Constitution, upon its *just principles*. They are aware of the artful designs of Britain, and have always been



jealous of these tories, who have favoured their measures. The WHIGS (falsely styled jacobins) are desirous to establish a government upon the equal rights of the citizens---ECONOMY in public expenditures---taxes within the ability, and agreeable to the circumstances of the people---a MILITIA instead of a standing army---a PEACE WITH FRANCE---and a national character as it respects all the powers of Europe.

The TORIES are opposed to these measures ; but are anxious to bring us into a controversy with France, and alliance with England. They are panting for a STANDING ARMY---an INCREASE OF TAXES---a MULTIPLICITY OF OFFICERS :---In short, to bring us within the vortex of the British government, (which has been declared as the “ most stupendous effort of human wisdom,”) and to copy all the expensive systems which have nearly bankrupted that nation. Such are the men who oppose Mr. Jefferson.

These, sir, are my sentiments of a Junto, who are now, thank God, brought before the tribunal of the public ; and may the vindictive resentment of an injured people never be satiated till they are placed in that *humble station*, in which they have attempted to *debase this country*.

## No. XV.

## RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE.

*To the Author of “The Jeffersoniad,” in the Centinel.*

YOUR principal charge against Mr. Jefferson is, that he is opposed to the Christian religion. But so far from proving this, you have not produced one evidence to support your allegation. On the contrary, if we are to judge from his writings, he is the advocate of that religion by which Christ has made us free. He has brought the whole system to that point, through which CONSCIENCE is to direct us in the great business of Salvation, in opposition to imposed articles of faith. He has vindicated this primary principle, in contradiction to those who placed themselves in the chair of *infallibility* ; in some manner, as our Saviour did, in condemning

the scribes and pharisees during his pilgrimage on earth. The Jewish sanhedrim set themselves as the TEST of religious orthodoxy; and every act, which our Saviour did, was opposed by them, as subverting the established system of Jewish religion. The Church of England, in their religious creed, was as justly obnoxious to Mr. Jefferson, and every catholic citizen, as the Jewish hierarchy was to our Saviour. This hypocritical junto were stigmatizing THE AUTHOR OF OUR RELIGION in the same opprobrious manner as the Essex junto now do Mr. Jefferson. His disciples were styled men, "who were turning the world upside down." The *Chief Priests*, Scribes, and Pharisees, were his most inveterate enemies. They would have crucified him much earlier than they did, "but for fear of the people." The People received him gladly, but the *Chief Priests* were always inflaming the minds of the multitude, and were the most desperate foes he had to encounter. The fact is, the whole history of our Saviour shows, the *hypocrisy of priests and their minions*. They early combined against him, and by their insidious machinations drove Pontius Pilate to condemn him.

The history of our Saviour shows the dangerous tendency of *Priestcraft*. When a country is once brought under their influence by established Tests, the most virtuous part of the community fall a sacrifice to their fanaticism. Let any man read over the New Testament, and note down the frequent clamours of the *Chief Priests* and Rulers against our Saviour, and they will find, that the whole opposition to his ministry was through this medium, and their apprehensions of the downfall of Diana of Ephesus. Judas received his thirty pieces of silver from them; and every desperate measure to ensnare and betray him was by the secret plottings of a junto, influenced by the immediate agency of priests and their sanguinary myrmidons. Even after he was crucified, "the Chief Priests gave large money to the soldiers," to fabricate a falsehood on his resurrection.

This has been the case in all countries where religion is established by government. The Church of Rome has thus been able to rise to its pre-eminence. The Church of England, &c. have been founded on the basis of an extensive hierarchy. Our fathers fled from ecclesiastical tyranny and their sons will never submit to such degrading servitude. In Virginia, before Mr. Jefferson illumined the mind by his writings, a disbelief in St. Athanasius'

creed was a crime, which nothing but the flames of the stake could cancel. Confiscations, imprisonments, whippings, and scourges, were the more lenient measures to proselyte men to the absurd doctrines of the Established System. The mind of the people was enslaved by priests, and the dogmas of the gown and surplice were to be equally obeyed with the oracles of the Supreme Being.

In this state of things, who will not revere the magnanimity and catholicism of Mr. Jefferson? Who will not esteem him for enlarging the human mind to contemplate the great subject of religion? What American would wish to be enslaved in his conscience, and bound by halters and gibbets to adopt the tenets of a proud priest, who received an annual salary for lording it over Christ's heritage? Such absurdities might answer in the dark ages when mankind were so ignorant, that a black coat, or lawn sleeves, were as terrific, as the thunder and lightning from Mount Sinai. But, thank heaven, the world is too enlightened to be duped by priests; and the people can read, and determine on sacred things with that liberality and correctness which spurn at the leading strings of interested bigots. The days of martyrdom have long since passed away, and the torch of Smithfield has, thank God, been extinguished.

Not but that the Clergy ought to be respected in their profession; but to suppose that they are to dictate tenets, or that any sect is to assume a right to control others, is an idea too derogatory to be admitted at the close of the eighteenth century. Such preposterous absurdities had their effect three centuries ago, but we hope the present generation will give an evidence, that they have grown wiser than to subscribe to such ignominious articles of faith. To the honour of America, though of late a few clerical characters have disgraced their profession, and defiled their garments, yet the liberality of the Clergy in general cannot but excite our veneration. A Prince, Sewall, Mather, Colman, Chauncy, Mayhew, Cooper, and a Clarke, with others now on the stage, stand testimonials of their patriotism. These great and good men were really champions in the cause of Religious Freedom, and stood forth in opposition to every arbitrary system to enslave or control the rights of conscience. These are men who would embrace Mr. Jefferson with the utmost cordiality.

The abusive treatment given to Mr. Jefferson by you, Decius, and others, is a proof of the baseness of your cause, and the folly of your conduct. I would ask, whether you suppose that the people of the United States will ever subscribe to a Religious Test? Do you expect that the Quakers, Baptists, Congregationalists, Universalists, Unitarians, &c. will admit the infallibility of any particular Church? Do you expect that they will join St. Athanasius in his anathemas?—You may pretend to talk about Mr. Jefferson's infidelity, but your whole charge against him amounts to this, that he reprobates in his writings, the impositions on the various professions which differ from the English hierarchy and supremacy. Do you mean to contrast Mr. Jefferson with Mr. Adams? Do you wish to insinuate, that Mr. Adams is in favour of a Religious Test, as a national establishment? While you condemn Mr. Jefferson for his catholicism, are you desirous to represent Mr. Adams as the advocate of an *arbitrary church discipline*? In plain words, are you for an Inquisition? Let us, Decius, understand the object you are aiming to accomplish. Are you daring enough to say, that Mr. Jefferson is unfit for President, *because he is a friend to the RIGHTS of CONSCIENCE*, and that Mr. Adams ought to be chosen, because he is determined, during his administration, to adopt a national religious platform? Are you arrogant enough to assert this?—But whether you do, or not, the application of your arguments amounts to it. You say, that Mr. Jefferson is opposed to a Religious Test, and, being so, is not worthy the Chair of President. Does it not then follow, by a parity of reasoning, that Mr. Adams is in favour of a Religious Test, and therefore is worthy of it?

Your arguments, Decius, prove so much against yourself, that it is needless to expose them. You attempt to calumniate Mr. Jefferson, but what you say in opposition to him, if intended to apply in vindication of Mr. Adams, is greatly unfavourable to him. For his honour and reputation, I hope such an application will not be made. Would a Quaker, Baptist, Congregationalist, Universalist, Unitarian, vote for Mr. Adams, if they supposed that what you alleged against Mr. Jefferson was approved by him? Are you so ignorant as to think, while you are condemning Mr. Jefferson for giving every sect the freedom of conscience, that you are helping Mr. Adams by suggesting that he is opposed to this privilege? However you may cloak your designs, yet, upon

fair ground, drawn from your own premises, the conclusion is, that you are in favour of Mr. Adams in expectation of such an event.

As a friend, Decius, I would advise you to desist from prosecuting your publications ; for depend on it, your arguments are injuring, rather than favouring Mr. Adams. You will soon raise an opposition from a quarter you little suspect, and their clamours will arise from those documents which yourself have furnished.

An injudicious friend, is the worst enemy ;—and you may rest assured, Decius, that your publications will go farther towards the election of Mr. Jefferson, than any hitherto exhibited to the public. You have so unskilfully wielded your weapon, that it will finally recoil upon yourself. Mr. Adams's friends will *curse* you, and Mr. Jefferson's friends will *laugh* at you. You will become the sport, not of a *small*, but of a *large party*, “at a future day.” You will find, in the course of a few numbers, that you have furnished me with weapons to lay you, and your detestable junto, prostrate.

## No. XVI.

## PLOTS ! PLOTS ! PLOTS !

*To the Author of “The Jeffersoniad,” in the Centinel.*

YOUR lucubrations have become so deficient, both in argument and decency, that even to notice them requires an apology to the public. *Your observations* are unworthy a serious refutation ; but at present I shall make use of you, as a *common sewer*, to carry off the filth, which has been collecting under the auspices of a desperate *tory junto*. They have become, in a political sense, as destructive as the yellow fever, and require a *national “board of health,”* to purge the country of their pestiferous infection.

Though my numbers are addressed to you, yet I would not flatter you so far, as to lead you to suspect that I considered *your remarks* on Mr. Jefferson as having a tendency to lessen his character—They favour too much of the essence of Billingsgate to excite the attention of the candid ; and are too deficient in argument to proselyte any man who values his literary reputation.

Leaving you, Decius, out of the question, I shall go on to observe, that the variety of measures adopted by the *tory junto* in this country, for the four years past, are worthy the particular consideration of the WHIGS, at the present crisis. Every contrivance which stratagem could devise, or intrigue fabricate, has been fraudulently practised on the unsuspecting citizens, to effect their base purposes ; a deep-laid system of deception has been pursued, and the most low tricks used, to intimidate the cautious, and terrify the ignorant. Every little dirty manœuvre has been so artfully managed, that the paltry efforts of a faction have succeeded to accomplish a temporary advantage. At one time, a TUB-PLOT was founded as the tocsin throughout the United States. The terror was so universal, that every old woman expected to find treason and rebellion wrapped up in a bundle of linen ; and the contents of a *washing-tub* were inspected with as much accuracy, as the entrails of birds and beasts in the days of augury.

This *tub mania* operated with wonderful success, till at length it gave way to a more mysterious TAILOR-PLOT. To use a vulgar expression, “the devil was to pay among the tailors.” All the *cross-legg’d* fraternity (as if touched with the wand of Harlequin) were *cried down*, as being employed to make uniforms for an army of jacobins, who were (it was said) to join the French on their landing in America. This industrious *thread-and-needle* brotherhood were generally suspected to be in league with France, to aid Bonaparte in his descent on the United States. Every tailor’s shop in Philadelphia was considered as “pregnant with evils” as the belly of the Trojan horse ; and was viewed as the rendezvous of a banditti of “*wild Irishmen*,” who had enlisted in the service of the French Directory. The *tailor-plot* was so terrific, that, instead of beholding *honest Buckram*, *nine degrees below par*, he was magnified to a political Falstaff ; his needle an Herculean wand ; and his shears a guillotine, besmeared with the blood of martyr’d federalists. Little David, with his sling and stone, was not so formidable to Goliath, as the tailors in Philadelphia, with their goose and bodkin, to the government of the United States.—Thus were those honest, industrious citizens stigmatized by a *junto*, as the enemies of their country.

The *tailor-plot*, however, passed over as harmless as the morning dew, and the next scene presented was a LADY-PLOT. In this

part of the tory drama, every danger was apprehended. A woman ! a woman ! was all the cry. A French *man* and a French *woman*, tub-plots, and tailors, were represented as forming an alliance of the most formidable nature ; a *woman* was to set fire to the magazine, and the President, Senate, and House of Representatives, with the Hon. Theodore Sedgwick at their head, were to share the fate of King, Lords and Commons, under the fatal explosion of Guy Faux, with his dark lanthorn. The whole government of the United States was to ascend towards Heaven in columns of smoke, and the Constituted Authorities were to rise to the same elevation in chariots of fire.

These several Plots, however, did not succeed so fully, as to answer the purposes of the tory faction. At length, Mr. Harper contrived to tie a *bundle of plots* together, which he emphatically christened "CLUES TO CONSPIRACIES." He exhibited them to Congress, in as much order as a Connecticut trader would a bunch of onions. As occasions offered, he could *wind off* a skein of "Clues," with as much facility as a country girl would a skein of stocking-yarn. These "Clues to Conspiracies" were advertised in Fenno's, Porcupine's, and some modest papers in Boston, as discoveries which would inevitably blow up the jacobins. The tories were on tip-toe to see the whole club in the air ; and were as pleased with the idea, as ever the Duke of York was, to find himself out of the reach of the French army. "Harper's Clues," however, soon became like the baseless fabric of a vision, and he and his supporters sunk into that contempt, which their folly and ignorance merited.

Plots ! plots ! at length lost their efficacy. The people got wearied out with such nonsense and absurdities ; and the tory junto, being baffled in their projects, had recourse at last to the despicable insignia of a COCKADE. In this part of the farce, they appeared more ridiculous than ever. To see a group of old men, swaggering through the streets, *en militaire* ; and a cluster of boys, singing the *formidable ditty* of

"When I was a little boy, my mother kept me in,  
But now I am a great boy, I'm fit to serve the king,"

interspersed with a few straggling negroes ; with a huge throng (to

fill up the chasm) of sycophants, who were courting public favour, exhibited a scene which naturally excited the laughter and pity of every considerate citizen. This COCKADE-influenza was rather harmless, as folly was the only conspicuous trait which marked its progress—Only one blot remains on it, which was, the cowardly action of tearing a *tri-coloured one* from the hat of an *invalid* Frenchman ; but as we know the man and his co-adjutors, who were guilty of this disgraceful action, it is an apology for the stigma attending the transaction.

The tory junto, in this stage of the business, got to their *ne plus ultra* ; ingenuity was exhausted. They stood at bay for some time, till they hit upon an expedient to rouse their drooping spirits. RELIGION ! RELIGION ! was in danger ;---an *Illuminati* was about to *darken* the Christian world ;---Deism, Atheism, and every other evil was about to take place among mankind. Some of the reverend Doctors of Divinity were on fire to extirpate the pernicious Society ; and they wrote in the public papers so many absurdities, that all their rhapsodies became the subject of ridicule, and themselves the objects of derision.

Thus, for these four years past, have the citizens of the United States been imposed on by a tory faction. Alarms, terror, threatenings, and fraud, have been the weapons by which they have assailed the good sense of the people. Every species of imposition has been practised to accomplish their wicked purposes : those whom they could not *coax* they intimidated, and those they could not *intimidate* they coaxed. They have pursued so detestable a system, that they have been afraid and ashamed to encounter those who had spirit and resolution to challenge them to an explicit contest. They have acted the part of assassins towards their opponents, by attempting, in an insidious manner, to injure them in their business, and asperse their characters. No measure, however base and infamous, has been neglected by this desperate junto, to *raise themselves*, and *depress others*. But, thank God, they are frustrated in their designs ; and we trust in heaven, that the time will soon arrive, when the perfidy of such adversaries will be as conspicuous to the public as their baseness is despised by their opponents.

Plots, Illuminati, Ocean massacres, &c. having lost their efficacy, the tory faction are now watching the motion of the waters in



the ensuing election for President. Their last resource is, to calumniate Mr. Jefferson as an enemy to the Christian religion. The same persons who have hitherto deceived the citizens about tub-plots---who have propagated the LIE of the Ocean massacre, are now busy in scandalizing Mr. Jefferson. They have worn out every other falsehood, and are now reduced to the miserable subterfuge of calling him an atheist. The fact is, Mr. Jefferson in his writings vindicates the *right of conscience on the subject of religion*, while his antagonists are planning in conclave, to erect a national hierarchy, to control and tyrannize over every other religious establishment. This must be the case, otherwise it is impossible that so much virulence should appear against him, for attempting to place every sect on an equal footing. Judge then, fellow-citizens, between Mr. Jefferson and his opponents.

The deceptions which have been practised on the public, and the falsehoods propagated by those whose duty it is to study the TRUTH, have had a great tendency to destroy the morals of the people, and to render them inattentive to the precepts of the gospel. When they find so many of the Clergy deceiving them with foolish political tales, the people begin to doubt the validity of those doctrines which they preach and enjoin. When they observe more zeal to propagate political, than evangelical principles, the people suspect, that the apparent sanctity of such Clergymen is more a cloak of hypocrisy, than a garb of piety ; more especially when they find, that falsehoods delivered in the pulpit are not rectified even after the preacher is convinced of the fallacy of his assertion. Common honesty dictates to a certain Reverend Doctor, that he ought to acknowledge his error on the Ocean massacre. It is to be feared, that a few overheated ecclesiastic partizans, have done more injury to the cause of Religion, than all the deistical or atheistical writers either in France, England, or America. A few leading Clergymen have shown such an intolerant spirit---have acted and preached with a temper so unbecoming the mild catholic precepts of the gospel, that many serious persons have become so far disaffected, as to neglect an attendance on public worship. The pulpit in many instances has been a political theatre, and days set apart for religious worship, have been converted to party rant, and defamation. The society instead of being entertained or instructed

in matters of religion, have been enraged against each other by the inflammatory dogmas of the preacher.

This subject is so copious, I shall appropriate another number for a *more serious* discussion.

## No. XVII.

DR. MORSE ON THANKSGIVING AND FAST SERMONS.

WHILE considering the "*decay of religion and morality*," so generally complained of among the enemies to Mr. Jefferson, it is proper to insert the following quotation from Dr. Morse's Geography, which may lead us to judge of *one cause* of their decline—viz:

"There is one distinguishing *characteristic* in the religious *character* of the people of New-England, which we must not omit to mention, and that is the custom of annually celebrating FASTS and THANKSGIVING-DAYS. This pious custom originated with our venerable ancestors, the first settlers of New-England, and has been handed down as sacred through successive generations of their posterity. A custom so rational, and so happily calculated *to cherish in the minds of the people a sense of their dependance on the GREAT BENEFACITOR* of the world, for all his blessings, it is hoped will ever be sacredly preserved."

A sentiment of this kind, coming from the Doctor, it is natural to suppose would have had a proper effect on his mind on those anniversaries. Instead of leading his audience to speculative points of politics, in his fast and thanksgiving sermons, we might expect that his discourses would have a tendency "*to cherish, in the minds of the people, a sense of their dependance on the GREAT BENEFACTOR of the world, for all his blessings*." Instead of becoming a fiery zealot as a *politician*, we should conjecture he would have been more conspicuous as a *divine*. His sermons, on these occasions, have been more calculated to light up the torch of persecution, than to inculcate the benevolent principles of the gospel; they have been more congenial with the anathemas of a pope, than the mild persuasions of a disciple of our Saviour. He has not only wrote sermons *to preach*, but has increased them to an enormous bulk, *for publication*. His *appendix* has sometimes been longer than

his original discourses ; and the advertisements, *for the sale of them*, seemed more calculated to inflame the community, and to set neighbours at variance, than to promote that peace and good will which are inculcated in the scriptures. His pretended list of Illuminati, containing a number of outlandish names, may have excited the curiosity of the public, so as to make it a *catch-penny work*, but how far the imposition balanced the profit, is left for him to determine. An intolerant ecclesiastic, is of all characters the most to be dreaded ; not that I would judge too illiberally of the Doctor's intentions ; but if any thing has been published by him, as a *fact*, which afterwards turned out an egregious *falsehood*, he is bound in duty (as an honest man) to make a public confession of his crime. As a *Christian teacher* he would not wish to give circulation to so barbarous a story as the Ocean massacre, under all the sanctity of a pulpit performance, and yet be backward to acknowledge the falsity of the narrative. As a *clergyman*, who is giving, in his Geography, a "distinguishing characteristic of the people of New-England, in their observance of fasts and thanksgivings, which (he says) "is so happily calculated to cherish a sense of our dependance on the GREAT BENEFactor of the world," it cannot be supposed that he would be desirous to blast such an institution, by printing a sermon on this occasion containing a falsehood of the blackest nature. If he is honest (as no doubt he is) we candidly hope that this Reverend Divine will, ere long, make an humble confession of his fault, and publicly retract every observation which he has made on this fabricated story. This conduct would be honourable, and I cannot but please myself that he will soon give this specimen of his integrity. Many of his friends have expected to see it in print before this time ; but an apology has been given, that his various other cares, in collecting materials for his Geography, &c. have hitherto prevented its appearance.

These remarks on the Reverend Doctor would not have been so particular, had he not signalized himself so often in political controversies, and published so many hard things against others. But, as *reason* is now taking place of *declamation*, it is best to bring him to that point, in which he may shew his sincerity to the best advantage. The times require an explicit conduct ; and, in order to try the validity of professions, an appeal should be made to the consciences of those who profess to take "TRUTH for their guide," and

RELIGION "for their object." The touchstone of religion is, to acknowledge a fault after having committed it. Charity may cover a multitude of sins, but cannot hide the deformity of wilfully persisting in error. A man must cast out the beam in his own eye, before he attempts to pull out the mote which is in his brother's eye. Unless this is done, it will not do to talk about Illuminati, deism, atheism, or the decay of religion, &c. First let him shew his own veracity, and he will then feel a confidence in judging on other men's faults. If such an error had been committed in his Geography, he would have been bound in duty to rectify the mistake ; and, in candour to the Doctor, it must be acknowledged that he wishes to stand with equal reputation as an *evangelical*, and as a *geographical* author. Will calumniating Mr. Jefferson, as an infidel, atone for the impiety of affronting the Supreme Being, by returning thanks, "that though we have lost a *Washington*, yet we still have an *Hamilton*" ? Hypocrisy itself must blush at such duplicity.

The mode, in which our Fast and Thanksgiving Days has of late been celebrated, by some of the Clergy, has had a tendency to destroy that religious character, which distinguished our venerable ancestors. Those days originated from that pure principle which ought ever to govern a people professing godliness. They were set apart for the express purpose, "*to cherish in the minds of the people a sense of their dependance on the SUPREME BEING.*" But if we examine the sermons, preached for four or five years back, how greatly deficient are they on this point ? The people have assembled on those occasions, but how small a part of the sermons has been directed to this purpose ? Politics, instead of religion, has generally been the theme for contemplation. The mind of the audience, instead of being solemnized to adore the SUPREME BEING for all his mercies, has been convulsed with party controversies. The preacher, in many instances, has exhibited more the attitude of a *dictator*, than the solemn deportment of a Christian minister. The congregation has been greatly disturbed by the inconsiderate behaviour of the priest ; and the society have separated with as much personal irritation, as if they had been attending an electioneering town-meeting. Fast and Thanksgiving Days have been converted to days of strife, and the social circles have often been rendered disagreeable by the disgusting conduct and political

dogmas of a vindictive bigot. The GREAT BENEFactor OF THE WORLD has been but a secondary object, and the *names of men* have been oftener mentioned than the name of GOD, or JESUS CHRIST. The fact is, such an outrageous impulse has been excited, that some persons could scarcely walk the streets without being insulted. Fast and thanksgiving sermons were made political engines to propagate particular sentiments. They became a mere traffic, and were hawked about the streets like play-bills or quack-medicines. The papers were filled with advertisements of fast and thanksgiving sermons; the clergy seemed embodied, and the press groaned with new editions of Morse, Osgood, and Dwight, and even a *Gardner* vented his venomous spleen, shrouded within the pale of the sanctuary. Fast and thanksgiving days were days of political controversy; some of the clergy took the field, and their pulpits mounted as many guns as a first rate man-of-war. The pews of certain individuals were so particularly aimed at, that the persons were almost obliged to raise a *breast-work*, to screen themselves from their clerical assailants. Fast and thanksgiving days were, in a great measure, assumed as the privileged periods, when fiery zealots arraigned their congregations, to receive a sentence of condemnation for the deeds done as citizens and freemen; the culprits were summoned, and the reverend judge inflicted his punishment, under all the terror which naturally attaches itself to a sacerdotal anathema. When the congregation was dismissed, instead of hearing any thing which related to the business of the gospel, each one went away "*wagging his head*," and insulting his political antagonist. Amidst this torrent of political phrenzy, to the honour of many gentlemen in the profession, they omitted politics, and led their audience to adore that BEING, by whom all blessings come.

I would not be thought unreasonably severe in my remarks, but I can appeal to my fellow-citizens for the TRUTH of them. In a cool moment it is best to recapitulate these circumstances, as reflections on the unwarrantable behaviour of *some* Clergymen, may be of service to them in their future conduct; neither do I wish to censure *them* too rashly, but when they have been guilty of such improprieties, a plain statement of their "zeal without knowledge," may lead them to a *reformation*, if not to *repentance*. If their feelings are hurt by a revision of their proceedings, how do

they think those whom they have censured were able to stand the ordeal of their vindictive decisions? It is but a fair retaliation, that they should receive a few of those lashes which they have so unmercifully bestowed on others.

The prostitution of Fast and Thanksgiving days, from those pure principles which actuated our pious forefathers, has been a primary cause of the decay of religion. The people in too many instances have found them used by the clergy to improper purposes. The minds of the *aged* have been soured and imbibittered, while the *young* have been led to contemplate them only as set apart for political controversy. Instead of piety and devotion, politics have been considered as the subject to arrest the public attention, which naturally excited an indifference and inattention to every religious consideration. The worship of the Supreme Being, has scarcely formed a trait of our public discourses; instead of adoring HIM, we have blasted the French Directory---instead of returning HIM thanks, we have abused each other---instead of praying for a blessing, we have cursed those who differed from us. Society almost seemed rent asunder; contentions and bickerings, instead of love and unity, were too often the productions of those solemn ceremonies. Why then are we to look to *French philosophy*, or Mr. Jefferson's writings, for the *decay of religion*? Let us look at home, and inquire whether the *cause has not arisen among ourselves*, and from a source, from which we had a right to expect better things. Religion is constructed of the purest and most refined materials; an unskilful professor, though placed in a conspicuous station, may destroy its comeliness and deform its features: it requires the most delicate management, otherwise it receives more incurable wounds from its advocates, than from its most inveterate enemies. The garb of religion is of the most exquisite texture, and it may easily be torn asunder by those who attempt to wear it. A fiery zealot, in lighting up the torch to enforce it, endangers the system to a general conflagration. The mild precepts of our Saviour is the oil which burns in the lamp, and those who pursue a different course are the "foolish virgins" who are destitute of this vivifying ingredient. Though such persons may say, "I have eaten and drank in thy presence," yet the denunciation, "depart from me," will fall on those who have violated their sacred functions, and prostituted them to,

worldly purposes. Whilst the benevolent principles which are inculcated by Mr. Jefferson, to *give every man the right of conscience*, will be applauded, the fanatic reviler, who is willing to torture a man into his own creed, will be reprobated as an impostor, and an enemy both to God and man. May the religious of every sect think on these things.

---

## No. XVIII.

## CATHOLICISM.

*To the Author of "The Jeffersoniad," in the Centinel.*

IF our newspapers were confined within the territory of the United States, there would be no occasion to answer the many gross obfurdities which appear against Mr. Jefferson. But as they circulate in Europe, some reply is necessary to remove the stigma which otherways might be attached to them. A gentleman who has for so many years received the honours of his country, and been so highly respected by his fellow-citizens, cannot at this time require the assistance of his friends to vindicate his reputation. At the trying period of our revolution, he stood conspicuous both as a patriot and statesman. Among the worthies which adorn the pages of the American history, his name is enrolled with distinguished approbation and applause. Ever uniform and consistent with those republican principles which sustained America during her conflict with Britain, he has now brought on himself the curses of APOSTATE *whigs*, and the anathemas of professed tories. These men sicken at his virtues, especially those, who are basking under the sunshine of *lucrative offices*, and are sharing a large proportion of the money arising from the taxes of the people. *The degenerate sons of freedom*, are appalled at his magnanimity, and view with astonishment, that he has not, like themselves, sacrificed his political integrity, to his personal emolument. A Samuel Adams, and a Thomas Jefferson stand on that eminence of political rectitude, which distinguished them before the pecuniary means of government had a charm to violate their former professions. They still view the people as entitled to rights of which no constituted au-

thority can disarm them, and they feel those attachments to preserve the liberty of the citizens, which led them to defend it against Britain, and her tory satellites. Honour, and distinctions are no lures with them, to annul those blessings which America so dearly earned, neither has their elevation so far raised them above their fellow-citizens, as to distinguish them in classes by any degrading appellation. This *equality of rights*, both as it respects *civil*, and *religious liberty*, urged Mr. Jefferson to vindicate the RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE, and to disrobe the proud hierarchy, which had prostrated every other religious denomination to the lowest stage of vassalage. Not content with freeing America from the thralldom of Britain, he thought the work but half accomplished till he had declared the CONSCIENCES OF MEN FREE, SOVEREIGN, AND INDEPENDENT.

For this, my fellow-citizens, is this virtuous character abused ; for this is he vilified and calumniated ; for this noble display of catholicism he is called an enemy to his country ; for giving every man a right to worship God agreeably to his conscience, he is called a deist, and by some is absurdly denounced an atheist. Because he has attempted to administer the Constitution upon the principles of *economy* and *republicanism*, he is charged as subverting its principles ; because he is desirous to prevent burdensome taxes, and to make the government set light on our shoulders, he is designated as a disorganizer and friend to anarchy.

While reading the torrent of scurrility and billingsgate against him, the heart of every *real* American must palpitate with resentment ; we must turn indignant on those venal columns, which are prostituted to defame the character of this first of patriots ; the ghosts of Hancock and of Warren, with the host of heroes who have bled in defence of freedom, must frown with vindictive ire on such base ingratitude, and even Washington must view with abhorrence, the base treatment of *the man whom HE delighted to honour*. The hero of Mount Vernon knew his worth, and confided in his virtues ; his talents were equal to the greatest emergencies, and his honour and integrity placed him above the groveling bias of executive patronage.

This is THE MAN, fellow-citizens, whom the *tory-faction* attempt to depreciate, to render suspicious, and to excite our detestation. They dread his virtues, and are afraid, lest in the execution of his office, he should make manifest their wicked machinations, to de-



prive us of our liberties. An host of such assailants are now active in their diabolical schemes, and have set in motion every detestable tool, and "*base-born*" sycophant, to accomplish their wicked purposes. But I trust in heaven they will be defeated, and instead of a Jefferson falling a prey to such a venomous faction, we fondly anticipate the happy prospect, when his enemies will be confounded by the approving voice of his fellow-citizens.

To injure the reputation of Mr. Jefferson, they have foolishly charged him with a design to *exterminate religion*, and destroy the *moral virtues* of the people. The writings and conduct of this gentleman are so contrary to designs of this nature, that his defamers must blush at the assertion. His Notes on Virginia are worthy the perusal of the christian and philosopher. The benevolence of his heart is worthy the imitation of the most devout ; and the accuracy of his investigations must enlighten and inform the most intelligent. As an author, he is an honour to his country, and the literary reputation of America is established in Europe, through the medium of his publications.

His political conduct is a great argument, that he is not desirous to injure either the religious or moral character of the people. His opposition to particular measures is a strong proof that he is for preserving them in their primitive purity. Mr. Jefferson has ever been opposed to systems, which had a tendency to produce those evils with which his enemies charge him. If he had a serious design to destroy all religious and moral principles, he would have been in favour of those measures which would have led to this fatal catastrophe ; he would have been an advocate for all those plans of speculation, which serve to dissipate and vitiate the mind, and lead the community to prey upon each other ; he would have studied a deep system of finance, whereby a stock-jobber, an usurer, and a sharper, might defraud his neighbour ; he would have planned ways and means to throw advantages into the hands of unprincipled speculators, and by a *dash of the pen*, to rob the old foldier of his hard-earned property, and reduce to poverty the widow and the orphan ; he would have matured plans to enrich a particular class of men, and have set a snare to violate every tie which cements society ; he would have made it *fashionable* to riot on the spoils of the unfortunate, and prostrate the virtuous to the

lowest stage of wretchedness. These are measures which he would have adopted, if he had designed to destroy every sense of religion and morality, but unfortunately for his enemies, he has ever expressed his abhorrence to such horrid systems, as lead to these *demoralizing* purposes. As a philosopher, he knew the human heart, and if he had a disposition to introduce irreligion and immorality, he would have pursued those measures, which had such a direct tendency to accomplish his wishes. More particularly would he have been in favour of a STANDING ARMY, that bane to every principle which ennobles the human mind. This would have been his favourite plan, as the most potent engine by which his projects could be effected. A rendezvous, for the enlistment of soldiers, would have been a more powerful channel to communicate his principles, than long philosophical dissertations. At such resorts, the drum and fife are more forcible arguments than fine-spun disquisitions---here the passions are inflamed, and scenes presented which strike the senses with the most lasting impressions. The language of a rendezvous, together with all the arts and tricks to entrap an inconsiderate youth, are allurements which lead the mind to the utmost stretch of profligacy.

The fatal effects of such an establishment have been too often felt in Boston, and with pain have we seen a long train of young men, following a standard in that state of intoxication, which fully proved the impropriety of the means by which they were induced to an enlistment. Such a display of immorality, and irreligion must have been pleasing to Mr. Jefferson, if he was desirous to extend such sentiments as are alleged against him, and he must have been doubly delighted, to find the *sweeping of the metropolis* garrisoned in different towns among the honest and industrious yeomanry. The profaneness, and indecent conduct which are heard, and observed in our streets, are in a great degree owing to this source of iniquity. To this may be attributed the *decay of religion and morality*.

If then, fellow-citizens, Mr. Jefferson is the character he is represented to be, how came he to be against a STANDING ARMY? Can it be supposed that he was ignorant of its tendency? No; if he wished to annihilate every trait of virtue and morality he would have enforced it with all the powers of rhetoric, and called on his fellow-citizens to aid the establishment. But, on the contrary, he

stands among the worthies who early discountenanced such a destructive evil.

AMERICANS !

Affume your wonted dignity-----revere the man who has thus deserved well of his country. Let not the enemies of our INDEPENDENCE blast the man who penned the immortal DECLARATION, more particularly, when HE is calumniated in those papers which eulogize a Suwarrow.

## No. XIX.

### PULPIT DECLAMATION.

AN enemy may be indulged to use his weapons, however weak and contemptible he may appear in the controversy. *Decius* has quitted the field in disgrace, and has left a feeble antagonist, under the signature of *Philanthropos*, to cover his retreat. The pursuit of such an adversary, though it cannot add laurels to the assailants, yet it is sometimes best to silence the croakings of such insignificant insects.

This *new commissioned general Philanthropos* (if we may judge from his diction) may more easily be designated by his *black gown* and *white bands*, that by any other professional distinction. He appears anxiously concerned for the reputation of the clergy, and expresses the greatest apprehensions, lest the *reverend appellation* should be brought into disrespect. In the height of his zeal, he has charged me as being a calumniator of this venerable fraternity—as desirous to depreciate their reputation—in short, he pronounces me an *infidel*, and uses other epithets equally as obnoxious.

This is a species of virulence and indecency of language ever used by bigots. Destitute of argument, they always have recourse to *hard names* and scurrilous reflections—they never reason, but entrench themselves within their sacerdotal, and abuse their opponents with every opprobrious term which malignity can devise or fanaticism suggest. Deist, atheist, infidel, defamer, disorganizer, are weapons with which they assail their antagonists : but they are such dastards in fair open controversy, that to confound them, it is only necessary to sketch their portrait, and they are terrified at the deformity of their own features.

Philanthropos possesses the venom of a fanatic to such a degree, that he disregards both truth and modesty. He has wickedly mistated my arguments, and unjustly represented me as an opposer of the *christian religion*. So far from depreciating the clergy in the character they ought to sustain, I have endeavoured to draw the line between those, *who violate their ordination engagements*, and those who act *agreeably to them*. A gospel minister and a political demagogue, are very distinct characters, and though both may wear a clerical badge, yet it does not require extraordinary penetration to discover the impostor.

The people, when they settle a minister, do not intend to erect a *clerical inquisition* within the parish. Politics were never contemplated in the articles of a church compact. They are willing to hear *gospel truths*, but are opposed to *political creeds*. A minister may imbibe certain doctrines of evangelical faith : having a specimen of his orthodoxy previous to his settlement, he has a right to maintain his tenets among his *society*, and endeavour to instruct them agreeably to the plan on which he first engaged in their service—but politics is a distinct subject on which no previous opinion had been determined, and he has no more right to impose his political creed upon the people, than to enforce any other speculative question whatever. If he employs his time in preaching on political subjects, he robs the parish, as they never gave him a salary to discuss controversies of this nature. Those clergymen, therefore, who have arrogated such liberties, either on the Sabbath, Fast or Thanksgiving Days, are not within the pale of the church, but must be considered as *heretics*, who have prostituted their sacred profession, and demeaned themselves to become the tools of a wicked and degenerate faction.

To evidence which, I will call on Philanthropos to answer, whether it is not highly degrading and derogatory to a *christian preacher*, to entertain a respectable and devout audience, with a story, which had no reference to the solemnities of the day, and which served to irritate the individuals who assembled for religious exercises on a stated anniversary ? and further, I would ask him, whether he can reconcile an *obstinate silence* in any man, if requested in *christian charity*, to acknowledge the rashness and precipitancy of his conduct ? If such a man is often charging others with deceiving the public ; if he has denounced particular characters, as in-

fidels, illuminati, disorganizers, &c. must he not be confounded, while he stands a self-convicted propagator of the most infamous falsehood? If he knows that his assertions in the pulpit were erroneous, and yet contemns every religious and moral obligation to rectify the mistake, we cannot but condemn him as a deceiver, even though he should pretend to advocate the truths of the gospel, or should be anxious to obtain missionaries to propagate the christian religion.

Suppose Mr. Jefferson had thus imposed on the public? what would Philanthropos have said to blast his reputation? How would he ring peals of anathemas against the author, and fill columns in newspapers to depreciate his character? And yet, strange to say, a *pious ecclesiastic*, of this description, can wipe his mouth with a hypocritical sanctity, and has the audacity to condemn others, while he stands pre-eminently conspicuous for calumny, distraction, and defamation.

As Philanthropos has charged me with a design to injure the clergy, I am bound in duty to declare, in my own vindication, that so far from wishing to traduce their character, I feel the utmost veneration for them. For this purpose, I have placed them on that ground which was contemplated by our Saviour. I have applied his doctrines as taught in scripture, and mentioned his denunciation against *such only*, as he expressly reprobates. If I am wrong, the scripture is the rule of error, as my quotations are wholly taken from this source. Philanthropos has charged me with a design to injure the clergy, because I have said, that the history of our Saviour was a proof of the wicked designs of a national hierarchy. To judge of this remark, let us refer to the Bible:—their character and conduct are thus given, viz. “That when the *chief priests* saw the wonderful things which he did, they were sore displeased;” he reprobates their pride, “that they made broad their phylacteries, and enlarged the borders of their garments; that they loved the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the market places, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi;” “that the *chief priests* mocked him, and said, he saved others, himself he cannot save;” “that they came unto Pilate after his crucifixion, saying, Sir, we remember that that *deceiver* said, when he was yet alive, after three days I will rise again.”

If such things should now be said by Him of the chief priests, while exercising their hierarchical functions, Philanthropos would cry out that He was deceiving the people, and there is no doubt he would condemn our Saviour for his jealousies of the clerical establishments. But, while he was thus condemning the hypocrites of those days, we do not find that *his disciples* were displeased with his conduct, or censured him for exposing the wickedness of an ecclesiastical fraternity. At that period, the long-robe gentry were fulminating the curses of the altar against him, and his humble followers ; HE and they were stigmatized as men, who were " turning the world upside down ;" the hirelings of the church were vociferous in their anathemas, and the temple of Ephesus was proclaimed as tottering to its centre ; the friends to our Saviour were persecuted, and the apostles were exposed to every insult, and finally fell martyrs to their integrity. Stephen, when stoned, was opposing the hypocrisy of priestly bigotry ; and even St. Paul declares that " he received his authority from the *chief priests*," on his sanguinary errand to Damascus. Among the thousands converted by Him, and his apostles, there does not appear *one priest* among the number.

To sum up the whole evidence of the Bible, it is clear, the *chief priests* were the persecutors of our Saviour during his residence on earth ; *they* arraigned him at the tribunal ; bribed Judas Iscariot to betray him, and afterwards laughed at his repentance ; *they* insulted him at the cross ; charged him with being a *deceiver* ; persecuted his disciples, apostles, and followers, and at length commissioned Paul to " pursue them to strange cities."

These particulars I mentioned in my former number, and for this I am accused by Philanthropos as a defamer of the *whole order of clergy*. My authority is from scripture, as it respects a *national establishment*, and while I can appeal to this document, the frowns of a few clerical bigots will be disregarded.

I freely make this declaration, that I am a friend to the clergy, in the character contemplated by our Saviour ; but in any other, they are on a level with other men, and if they enter into political controversies and endeavour to influence the people in their elections, they quit their clerical station, and must expect to receive in return as *plain dealing* as they give to others.

## No. XX.

## CONGRESSIONAL CAUCUS.

THE numberless absurdities of Decius, in opposition to Mr. Jefferson, render him so ridiculous, that in order to answer him a man is obliged to condescend to *frivolities*, which are degrading in a free country, even to treat with civility.—As a specimen of which, I will bring before the public an argument on which he is foolish enough to lay the greatest stress of his reasoning. He says, “that previous to the adjournment of Congress, a Caucus was held on the business of deciding on a President and Vice-President; and that Mr. Adams and Mr. Pinckney were agreed on as candidates”; and, to *enforce his argument*, he exclaims, “how unreasonable would it be for the people to frustrate this decision.”

Merely to state this circumstance is sufficient to frustrate such an unconstitutional and unwarrantable proceeding. It scarcely admits of a comment. It is too degrading to be seriously noticed, and yet Decius has the folly to offer this plea as a *conclusive argument*, why the citizens of the United States ought to accede to this determination.

If any thing will rouse the freemen of America, it must be the arrogance of a number of members of Congress to assemble as an *Electioneering Caucus*, to control the citizens in their constitutional rights. Under what authority did these men pretend to dictate their nomination? Did they receive six dollars a day for the double purpose of *caucussing* and *legislating*? Do we send members to Congress to *cabal* once in four years for President? or are we arrived to such a pitch of congressional influence, that what they decide on is to be binding on the United States? Is there any paragraph in the Constitution which gives them such an authority, or even countenances such a proceeding? After Congress have accomplished their legislative business, have they a right to dictate in the choice of an executive? If so, what an imposition on “the people” to talk about the freedom of election; or what consequence is it that the State Legislatures should concern themselves in the mode of choosing electors? If a Congress Caucus is to decide, we have only to inquire who the man is in whom they have

agreed, and notify him of his appointment. Why should we be at the expence of calling the Legislature together to choose electors, for according to Decius' reasoning the choice of President and Vice-President is already made? He tells us that they have agreed to vote for Messrs. Adams and Pinckney. If this is the case, let the Governor of each State only acknowledge these two gentlemen, and leave it solely to Congress to dispose of them.

It is full time that "the people" had fully ascertained their elective privileges; and if they mean to be led by Congressional or Legislative Caucuses, it is best the business should be openly acknowledged. For though an appeal to the citizens on this question might appear too abrupt, yet the system lately adopted comes very near to the same principle.

There appears of late a deep design to sap the elections of the people by the various manœuvres of a particular set of men. In the first place, we are called on by Decius to vote for Messrs. Adams and Pinckney, because a junto in Congress had previously determined on it; in the second place, an attempt was made in the Senate to place the choice of a President within the control of a select committee in Congress; in the third place, the people have been deprived of their usual mode of voting for electors, because the Legislature have assumed this right to themselves. These combined circumstances are certainly alarming, and ought to be checked in their early stages; otherwise it will become an *acknowledged right* in the Legislature to control the elections, and the constitutional liberties of the people, will, in consequence thereof, fall a sacrifice to such baneful encroachments.

The argument of Decius, therefore, so far from operating in his favour, ought to be reprobated as a high violation of the rights of "the people." If we admit his reasoning as conclusive, we may as well burn the Constitution and submit all our privileges to the individuals in Congress. The people have only to fold up their arms and set down quietly as the contemptible vassals of a domineering aristocracy.

But, thank God! there still remains a spirit which ought ever to actuate Americans. The Constitution yet stands a sacred pledge of the liberties of America. We feel too strong an attachment to its preservation to suffer any body of men to destroy its vital energies. It is the ark of political safety, and may the ven-



geance of heaven pursue the man who dares touch it with unhallowed hands. The freedom of election is the palladium of liberty, and while we exercise this right we may defy the power of tyrants and the intrigues of faction. The people of the United States place themselves on this mount, and on its permanent basis they rest the happiness of society. It is of no avail to them to hear that a majority of Congress have determined on a President or Vice-President ; they turn over the leaves of the Constitution and find it therein written, that THEY have a right to choose their electors, unbiassed by the decisions of any assumed power whatever. This is an interference with the constituted authorities, (THE PEOPLE) which demands the most pointed reprehension, and the men who have been guilty of such a profane breach of trust deserve the execration of the public.

The insolence of Decius in presuming to mention the determination of the members of Congress, must be placed to his ignorance ; he forgot he was writing to FREEMEN ; he forgot he was addressing men who were acting under a Constitution in the capacity of INDEPENDENT CITIZENS ; he forgot that his appeal was to those ENLIGHTENED ELECTORS who felt their own dignity and importance on this interesting question. What ! Decius ! ! are you daring enough to arrest the votes of Americans, by telling them that their *servants* in Congress have already decided the choice ! ! Are you so abandoned as to stab the Constitution to its vitals, by checking the free exercise of the people in their suffrages ? *If you are* thus desperate, may their decisions give a lesson to deter in future such imperious conduct.

## No. XXI.

## OBSERVATIONS ON ARISTIDES.

IT is a melancholy truth, that a *faction* in this country have been able to pursue a system of political measures, which has plunged it into a most serious and alarming situation. This insidious junto have had the address to palm themselves on the unsuspecting citizens, as the friends to government, and have had the effrontery

to designate their fraternity with the emphatical appellation of **FEDERALISTS**. Their impudence has been so outrageous, that they have had the audacity to brand every man with the epithet of *Jacobin*, who presumed to exercise a right to arraign their conduct before the tribunal of an impartial public. But heaven, in mercy to an injured people, has confounded their devices, and placed them in a predicament somewhat similar to Milton's fallen angels, in accusing and condemning each other.

How long have the citizens been imposed on by the disgraceful tales fabricated within the circle of these caballing associates! How many patriots have been sacrificed to promote their detestable purposes! How many characters have been wantonly sported with to exalt them to the highest elevation! and how many honest men have been degraded, to raise the satellites of this party to places of honour and profit.---Yes, fellow-citizens! we have seen the evil effects of this unprincipled combination, and this country has now to deplore its unhappy situation, in consequence of the fatal policy adopted by those, who have too long trespassed on our patience and confidence. It is rather singular, however, that every assertion made by those, who are styled *Jacobins*, are proved to be facts, by the very men, who have been most forward to denounce them.

It is a distressing reflection, that the stratagems and intrigues of a number of unprincipled individuals should have so far succeeded, as to bring America to its present crisis. If the mischiefs had expired on the discovery of their designs, or their baneful effects had ceased to operate on the divisions among themselves, we might now contemplate the subject with some degree of composure; but their measures have been "pregnant with evils," and their names will long be execrated, in consequence of the misery entailed on this abused country. If it is true, that "Mr. Hamilton is the principal instrument in exciting an unfounded alarm, and producing measures which put the country to unnecessary expense"; that "he addressed the citizens of the United States on the necessity of raising an army, and endeavoured to convince them of the danger of invasion, when it was altogether chimerical, and almost morally impossible"; that the main object, in establishing this army, was to crush every domestic opposition, and eventually to "give a government to this country by force"; that he proposed an

establishment of 50,000 infantry, and 10,000 cavalry; that he is the "father of the military system," and that his influence has been such, as to force the government into this unnecessary measure, contrary to the wishes and recommendations of the President. If these charges can be substantiated, then the controversy wears a serious aspect.

This, however, is the character drawn of General Hamilton, by the author of a Letter addressed to him, under the signature of Aristides, and supposed to be written by *Noah Webster*, Esq. If he is false in his statement, let Mr. Hamilton contradict his assertions. While contemplating this subject, in the extensive sphere thus described by Aristides, it rises to a magnitude which must rouse the attention of every friend to America;—that he should be able to effect a military system, contrary to the sentiments of the executive; that he should have such a control over the chief magistrate, as to carry plans in opposition to his wishes; that he should throw such an enormous expense on the people, by exciting an unfounded alarm, and at length come forward, in the face of the *public, and abuse* the President for presuming to act contrary to his will and pleasure. In this point of view what must we think of Alexander Hamilton? Where is the American, who ever thought, that within so few years after the adoption of the Federal Constitution, that the government of the United States would have been so far prostrated to the ambition of one man? What! are the people of the United States to be burdened with a debt of millions, to discharge the expenses of an army, raised *in opposition to the judgment of the President*? Does the Constitution recognize any other persons than the Constituted Authorities, or have the people any other means than to arraign the real culprits to the bar of an injured country? What other atonement can be made, for the millions expended by the intrigues of such unprincipled individuals, or for the false alarms excited by their arts and stratagems?—In a free country, the inquiry ought to embrace the extent of the evil, as the constitution never substituted a *scape-goat*, or assigned a city of refuge to the men whom it held *responsible*.

Aristides, after describing Mr. Hamilton in the manner before recited, introduces another important transaction, in which he says, "many influential characters in government were engaged, particularly *Timothy Pickering*, late secretary of state." This measure was no

less than “*a treaty offensive and defensive with Great-Britain.*” In this part of the business, Aristides introduces a singular assemblage of characters, viz. the British Minister and *Peter Porcupine*; the latter, in particular, “proposed and urged an offensive and defensive treaty between the United States and Great-Britain.” He further alleges, as a fact, “that Porcupine was an *Agent of the British Minister*, and corresponded with the under Secretaries of State”: and to top the climax, Aristides asserts, “*as a well known fact*, that he had won over to his interest, the *Government-Paper of the United States.*”

Here, reader, I must beseech you to pause, and reflect on the precipice over which our country has been suspended! Consider seriously the dreadful gulph into which we were threatened to be plunged. While we think on this subject, we cannot but tremble at our own situation. The foregoing recitals, on the conduct of men, are not the vague declamations of persons who are desirous to disorganize and convulse the government, but they are documents taken from a writer, who declares himself “too long the faithful servant of his country, to incur the suspicion of apostacy,” and who has written in vindication of Mr. Adams, in answer to Mr. Hamilton. This man tells the public, *as matters of fact*, “that Hamilton *was the father of the military system*”; “that it was adopted by his instrumentality, and contrary to the inclination of the President”; that Pickering, and other influential characters, were desirous of a treaty offensive and defensive with Great-Britain”; “that the British Minister stood ready to close the fatal contract”; and, still further, “Peter Porcupine had urged the measure, and had so far corrupted the streams of public communication, as that he had won over the state paper of the government.” Are these things true, as asserted by this author? I do not pretend to say they are, but they certainly require some explanation from the parties.

Gracious heaven!!—Is it possible, that America should be reduced to so humiliating and degrading a position? That an army should be raised by deceiving the constituted authorities, by whose sanction alone it could have been brought into existence? But the degradation increases in its ignominy, when we find that a *British corporal* should have the effrontery to prosecute his plans by the secret agency of the British Ministry. Thus the Executive

was deceived to raise an army, while Porcupine had, by his address, secured the patronage of the governmental printer. A hopeful state truly, for the free, sovereign, and independent States of America.

Ye spirits of Hancock, Warren, and Montgomery ! if, in the regions of bliss, the concerns of your country arrest your attention, how must the pleasures of heaven be allayed, to learn the abasement of your country ! How must indignation fire your souls, to find that a *wretch*, so debased as *Cobbett*, should be employed by individuals, to accomplish the wicked designs of involving us in war, and that he should obtain such an *ascendancy*, as to pollute the streams of public information ! How changed since the days of our revolution ! when even GEORGE THE THIRD, with his host of troops, were baffled by the patriotism and integrity of the free born citizens of America ; and when a *contemptible corporal* and his accomplices would have been hissed out of the country, with every mark of detestation and disgrace. The contrast is too humiliating, to dwell any longer on the subject ; but I trust that the flame of our revolution will not be extinguished by the *weakest engine* of the British nation. On the present emergency, may THE PEOPLE rally round the CONSTITUTION, as the mount on which their political ark is to settle with permanency. In this intrepid attitude of FREEMEN, may they check their enemies, and finally place them in that debased station in which they have attempted to put the independent Citizens of America !

AMERICANS,

“ Let then all that is *party* be obliterated, and let all that is AMERICAN appear” ; may it *appear* in that effulgence, as to blast the *ignis fatuus* of a faction, who wish to ally us with Britain : May the American citizens embody in a PHALANX, and counteract, with persevering resolution, the machinations of those who are planning our ruin.

## No. XXII.

### APPEAL TO THE CLERGY.

“ THE snare is broken and we have escaped,” has of late been an expression of *thankfulness* in our public devotions ; but, while

we adore the SUPREME BEING for his mercies, it behoves us to watch those who have attempted to destroy us. The tory faction, who have long been planning a system of extermination, as it relates to France, have been equally as assiduous to connect the United States in an alliance with the oppressive government of Britain. This party have wished to bring the two countries into a solemn league and covenant, and have been daring enough to risque the peace, happiness and independence of America, on the uncertain and convulsed state in which Britain is now plunged. This alliance is as unnatural as winter with summer ; notwithstanding her parade of energy, yet the immensity of her debt on the commencement of a peace, will unavoidably throw her into paroxysms of dissolution.

A young government like America, to ally itself with Britain, is of all things the most absurd and ridiculous ;—a nation, in its vigor, to attach itself by treaty, to follow all the speculative and desperate projects of one so peculiarly circumstanced as the English, must be considered by every reflecting man as injudicious and impolitic. However anxious some are for their success against France, yet the United States have more to dread from the imposition on their commerce by the British, than from any other power in Europe. Have we experienced that friendship from her, that America can feel an attachment for her welfare ? Has she respected our neutrality, during the present war, even though we have sacrificed our interest by a disgraceful treaty ? Did she exhibit such patience, magnanimity, and generosity towards us, during our revolution, that we can confide in her friendship, *in case she succeeded against her European enemies ?* The OLD TORIES and APOSTATE WHIGS may say YES ! but *their judgment* is not the criterion in the present question. I would rather apply to the citizens of America, who have experienced the vindictive temper of Britons, Hessians, and Waldeckers ; I would rather apply to those, who saw the flames of Charlestown, Portland, Norfolk, &c. who experienced their cruelty on board the guard ships at New-York ; who wept over the houses of worship, dismantled of their steeples, pulpits, pews, and sacramental tables ; whose feelings were put to the torture, in observing the sanctuary converted to an equestrian theatre ; who heard the profane language of a soldiery, within the temple which had long become venerated by the presence of a

Prince, and the benedictions of a Sewall ; to those, who were accustomed to the pleasing voice of a Whitfield, when the *Old South* was crouded before the sun had streaked the eastern horizon. These are the characters to whom I would make my address ; especially at this period, when RELIGION, pure and undefiled Religion, is brought forward as the test of patriotism. What say ye, citizens of New-England ?---Ye CLERGY, what is your opinion ?---Ye men of piety, in holy orders, what confidence can you place in those who have so grossly and impiously profaned your houses of worship, and who disturbed your devotions on the day set apart for public worship ? Can the ministers of the gospel now become the friends of those who have shewn such a disposition of enmity to that BEING whom they adore ? After driving the flock from their wonted pastures ; after introducing *beasts* for sport on the altar where the *souls of men* were prostrated before the majesty of heaven ; after polluting the courts which led to Zion's gates with every obscenity which could disgrace human nature---can ye, *ye ministers of the gospel*, embrace the perpetrators as the friends of God, or to the cause in which you have engaged ? Such an unnatural alliance is affronting to heaven, and must in the end be reprobated by some evident marks of its displeasure.

The minds of the Americans have been inflamed on the subject of *religion*, and directed to anathematize the French as the only subverters of this sacred institution. But what nation has ever been so hostile to the principles of this country as the British ? From the first settlement of America, has not the hierarchy of the church been attempting to annihilate the independency of our religious establishments ? Why did a Mayhew and a Chauncy enter the field of controversy against the assumed rights of National Episcopacy ? Why did those religious patriots encounter the spiritual weapons of bishops and their host of hireling scribblers ? Why were they blasted as disorganizers in their sacerdotal professions ? The answer is plain, because they opposed those who wished to "lord it over Christ's heritage."

During the revolution this spirit was evidenced in the most striking colours ; our *Presbyterian meeting-houses* were the peculiar objects of resentment ; they were styled *Schism-shops*, and every shaft of calumny and detraction was directed against their supporters ; scarcely was a town entered by the British troops but the

houses of worship experienced their particular violence. In the town of Boston the inhabitants can recollect the large proportion which fell a sacrifice to their hostilities. Their conduct was so vindictive, that it seemed a war of *religious extermination*, and they placed our *Presbyterian* worship in such a ridiculous point of view, that they wantonly aimed at those houses which were distinguished for the veneration of the men who had preached within them. Dr. Sewall was eminent throughout the world for his piety, and therefore they chose to signalize his sanctuary for the most degrading amusements; they continued in their impiety till the old gentleman stalked before them, in the attitude of an injured ghost.—The *Old North* was distinguished by its venerable characters, and this ancient fabrick was destined to the flames. Many other places of worship (excepting the *Episcopalian*) were defiled by their unhallowed hands. Our Sabbaths were days of military parade, and the highest contempt was shown for every thing which wore the appearance of religion and morality; drums and fifes were the interludes to our devotion.

Fellow-Citizens! Is this too high a wrought picture of British proceedings in this country during our revolution? Ye aged patriots, I can appeal to you for the truth of the description: Ye venerable matrons, I can call on you for the propriety of the observations: Ye ministers of the gospel, some of whom now slumber on your posts, I will even venture to summon you as evidences to the foregoing statement. If I am wrong in my narration, come forward and deny the facts; but if I am right, you must accede to my principle.

Where is the American then, who wishes an alliance with England, to defend either our civil or religious rights? But it has lately been declared, that “many influential characters in the government” have been desirous to accomplish this measure. On the present occasion, however, it may not be impertinent to inquire whether those persons are not the friends to Mr. Pinckney? Are they not desirous to make him President? Is he not the man who is the object of this particular party? It is true, he may not favor their designs, but we ought to be jealous of the candidate, who is supported by men of this description. Is he not patronized by the Essex Junto? And while we detest their politics, we must be careful of the man whom they recommend.



Unwarrantable jealousy is derogatory to an enlightened people ; but there are points of decision to which wise men will adhere. The crisis is important, and it calls on every considerate citizen to weigh *consequences*. If we mistake our situation, or become lulled into security, by the deceptive appellations of *federalists* and *jacobins*, our ruin is inevitable. Our government must depend on the wisdom of its administration, and the economy of its expenditures. An extravagant system must impoverish the people ; enormous taxes must press hard on the industrious citizens ; eight per cent. loans will increase the public debt beyond the ability of those who will be called on to discharge it. Let us then throw aside party spirit, and contemplate the man whose whole political conduct has been opposed to such measures : *Who this man is*, we have the strongest evidences ; as the abuse of Mr. Jefferson has solely arisen from his decided disapprobation of every *religious tyranny*, and his desire to administer the government on the pure and *ECONOMICAL principles of republicanism*.

Americans ! this being the state of the question, can we halt between two opinions ? Let us act like men, and exercise our rights as becomes the descendants of “ *well-born* ” Americans. The evidence of being “ *well-born*,” is to *preserve our freedom*. When this is permanently effected, then may we exclaim with pleasurable emotions, “ the snare is broken, and we have escaped ! ”

## No. XXIII.

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE NORTHERN STATES.

**I**N order to give a specimen of the *tendency* of your proceedings, I shall exhibit the character of Mr. Adams as described by Mr. Hamilton ; after revising this *portrait*, you may be able to draw proper inferences of your conduct.

Mr. Hamilton says—“ Mr. Adams does not possess the talents adapted to the *administration* of government ; he has intrinsic defects in his character, which *unfit him for the office of Chief Magistrate* ”—“ he is a man of an imagination sublimated and excentric—propitious neither to a regular display of *sound judgment*, nor to

steady perseverance in a systematic plan of conduct ;” and, says Hamilton, “ I began to perceive, what has been too manifest, that to these defects are added the unfortunate foibles of a vanity without bounds, and a *jealousy capable of discolouring every object.*” Mr. Hamilton goes on, “ the considerations which had reconciled me to the *success of Mr. Pinckney*, were of a nature exclusively public ; they resulted from the *disgusting egotism, the distempered jealousy, and the ungovernable indiscretion* of Mr. Adams’s temper, joined to some doubts of the correctness of his maxims in administration”— “ it will not appear exaggeration to those who have studied his character, to suppose that Mr. Adams is capable of being alienated from a system *to which he has been attached, because it is upheld by men whom he hates.*” Speaking of the American mission to France, he thus describes Mr. Adams, “ sometimes he has treated with *ridicule* the idea of its being a measure which would *terminate in peace* ;” at other times, “ that he has vindicated the measure, as one conformable with the general and strong wish of the country *for peace*, and as likely to promote that desirable object.”

This is the character given of Mr. John Adams, by Mr. Alexander Hamilton—and can any thing be more dishonourary and affronting ? *Outrageous passions, jealousy and duplicity*, are represented as the prominent features which mark his political portrait. While Mr. Hamilton thus defames Mr. Adams, he is equally as elaborate in his eulogiums on Mr. Pinckney.

Now, gentlemen, I would beg leave to ask you, with what propriety you could connect Mr. Adams and Mr. Pinckney in your votes for President and Vice-President ? Was there one man among the electors in the four New-England governments, who knew any thing about Mr. Pinckney, otherwise than by the character given him by Mr. Hamilton ? And provided he had not been nominated by him, whether you would have thought of this gentleman in connection with Mr. Adams ? You must excuse me if I say, that I very much doubt it. If this is the case, what could induce *you* to take up with the nomination of Mr. Hamilton, who had so severely treated Mr. Adams, and attempt to give Mr. Pinckney *an equal (if not a superior) chance* with him ? This was an alliance of the most unnatural kind ; for if Mr. Adams was in the least degree similar to what Mr. Hamilton had represented him, he was not deserving of your choice, and yet you have *reprobated* his opinion as

it respected Mr. Adams, while at the same time you have *approved* his nomination of Mr. Pinckney. How could you suppose that any cordiality could ever subsist between the gentlemen thus chosen : One was *denounced* by Hamilton as unfit for the office, and the other was the candidate of his warmest approbation. Certainly Mr. Pinckney would feel an obligation to *his patron*, and while in office would attempt to promote his political measures—Mr. Adams, on the contrary, being wounded by the censures thrown upon him, must ever be placed in a most disagreeable situation, to act in concert with a man, who obtained his votes by the recommendation of his opponent. Provided success had attended the election of these two gentlemen, Mr. Adams would have been “ of all men the most miserable.” He would have been mortified beyond expression, to see the man of *Hamilton’s nomination* in the first seat of government ; or if he *perchance* had obtained it, yet the problematical success of the election between them, would have produced feelings, which the tenderness of his mind could not easily have eradicated. Mr. Hamilton would have exulted over him, and might possibly *threaten* Mr. Adams as to the event of his next election.

Suppose that Mr. Pinckney had obtained a majority of votes, and was chosen President, what would the northern States have said to this business ? Would they not have seen that they were *duped* ? Would they not have discovered the artful plot, and would not every citizen have been chagrined at such an event ? Yet, gentlemen, you came near to give this triumph to a party, who were laughing behind the curtain at the game they were playing.

Sampson’s *fire-brands and foxes* were not a more unnatural alliance, than Pinckney and Adams, and it is probable that a “ small party ” calculated to produce as much mischief. After Mr. Hamilton had described Mr. Adams in terms so opprobrious, he could not sincerely wish him to be President.

This may be good policy, but I must confess it is beyond my comprehension. As friends to Mr. Adams, the candidate of Hamilton would have been the last man to be considered. It seemed a *pointed reflection* on both to bring them in contact. The connexion must have been so disagreeable, that I should suppose no friend of either would wish to have forwarded it. But the fact appears plain, that many who pretended to be the advocates

for Mr. Adams are his greatest enemies. They *bolstered* up Pinckney by the strength of Adams ; and this is evident, for at the late feast of the descendants of the Pilgrims, in this town, we see by the toasts the *real sentiments* of certain individuals. Hamilton is styled the *pure gold*, though deprived of his *official stamp* ; what is this but a direct implication on the President for his dismissal ? If then we find particular persons extolling him for his *purity*, notwithstanding his late attack on the President, can we hesitate to declare, that such men are HYPOCRITES, when they pretend friendship towards Mr. Adams ?

Excuse me, gentlemen, for these plain remarks—I have not studied elegance in diction, but I profess frankness in expression. The citizens will judge of the propriety of my remarks ; and as I write for *their information*, apologies are unnecessary. I do not censure you in your official capacity, but I must say, if you are friends to Mr. Adams, that you took a strange method to express your attachment.

The ESSEX JUNTO, that bane to our country, have thrown us into our present difficulties, and occasioned our inconsistencies and perplexities. They have calumniated Mr. Jefferson, and every honest republican throughout the United States ; and Mr. Adams, in his retirement, will have an opportunity to reflect on those delusions, which those who have been styled jacobins, cautioned him against. But we trust in heaven that the designs of this faction are frustrated, and that the snare is broken and we have escaped.

## No. XXIV.

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE NORTHERN STATES.

REPUBLICANS possess that magnanimity of mind, that they scorn to avenge themselves of their adversaries, by retaliating on the sordid principle of personal resentment. Though for many years past, they have been exposed to the insolence of every petty sycophant, who was seeking a maintenance from the federal government ; though singled out as objects of popular odium, by the detestable tools of an Essex faction ; though vilified from the press, and denounced from the pulpit ; though persecuted, defamed, and

libelled by every ignorant scribbler, who could wield his pen in opposition to the liberties of his country : yet, amidst this torrent of invective, the REPUBLICANS stand pre-eminent for their moderation, and feel such a superiority as will not suffer them to retort the pitiful and ignominious scurrility, which characterize their calumniators.

The REPUBLICANS wish not to screen themselves from a strict investigation of their conduct. They place themselves on the basis of the Constitution, and never dread an appeal to the public judgment, by threatening men with fines and imprisonment. Under the system of a pure *republican administration*, we hope never to hear the groans of a prisoner echoing through the recesses of a dungeon, for expressing his political sentiments ; nor to behold a wife and children bemoaning their misfortunes, by being deprived of the support of an husband and parent under the cruel hand of a relentless judiciary. Such excesses are abhorrent to *well-born* Americans.

The republicans depend on PRINCIPLE, and not on TERROR. The human mind is left unshackled, and permitted to contemplate in its utmost latitude the conduct of *men*, and the tendency of *measures*. They assume no control over public opinion, nor designate a particular party by the childish insignia of a black cockade. These degrading actions are beneath the philanthropy of republicans. They strive to convince, rather than to terrify. They appeal to the *reason* rather than the *fears* of their fellow-citizens : and if these salutary purposes are not effected, by these moderate measures, they pity and commiserate the obdurate. A gaol is not the temple of Apollo to convince the mind, and fines and imprisonment are arguments too unphilosophical to be offered as *rational conviction*. Magnanimity, benevolence, and moderation are the cardinal virtues ; and may the cause of republicanism never be disgraced by any species of conduct which designates tyranny.

After thus giving the outlines of republican tenets, I hope you will acquit me of exciting a system of terror under the new administration. Though an opposite line of conduct has hitherto been pursued by the opposers of the republicans, (the severity of which might justify an ample retaliation) yet the brilliancy of the cause in which they are engaged, I hope will never be clouded by imitating the degrading and disgraceful behaviour of a set of insolent, intolerant, insulting, and abusive wretches, some of whom have

been basking under the emoluments, and feeding on the loaves and fishes of government. Though the principles of republicanism soften the vindictive passions, yet they tend to the most critical scrutiny into all the motives and operations of their public servants. No man, or body of men, is considered *above* "The People"; THEY are the Alpha and Omega of power; they are the "checks and balances" which poise the political standard, and elections are the *weights* by which they decide merit.

These things being premised, gentlemen, I cannot but make a few more observations on the *tendency* of your conduct in the choice of President and Vice-President.

The consequences must have been fatal, had you succeeded in the election of Messrs. Adams and Pinckney. It might have been setting up two standards, to which the different parties would have repaired. The enemies of Mr. Adams knew this, and therefore urged their plans under the expectation of reviving their own party. They knew that they could not expect any preferment under Mr. Adams's administration; they therefore artfully linked themselves with Mr. Adams's friends, and, with the utmost subtilty of address, so far ingratiated themselves as to walk hand in hand like two fond lovers, towards the consummation of their designs. But their friendship was delusive; it might be compared to the assassin who had enticed the traveller to depend on his protection, and after obtaining his confidence, sacrificed him the first opportunity. All the expectations of this junto rested on the success of Mr. Pinckney, and if *he* did not succeed, they were satisfied that their plans were frustrated. To carry him under his own political reputation, they knew was impossible; they therefore stood ready to couple him, either with *Adams* or *Jefferson*:—and I am confidently told, that a proposition was made by Mr. Pinckney's friends for this purpose; but the supporters of Mr. Jefferson treated the compromise with every mark of contempt; they would not barter the general happiness to bring forward a party, which they considered as injurious to the general welfare, though it would completely secure the *election* of their candidate. Mr. Jefferson might have had a great support from Mr. Pinckney's friends, if his advocates had solely studied his elevation to the presidential chair, in preference to the *real republican principles*, which they meant by his election to substantiate.

As an evidence in point, of the impropriety of connecting Messrs. Pinckney and Adams, I will state a circumstance which would probably have taken place, in case Mr. Pinckney had been chosen *President* : and, as *you* gave him an *equal chance* with Mr. Adams, the event cannot be considered as altogether visionary. Suppose the first nominations of Mr. Pinckney had been Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Pickering, one as Secretary of State, the other Secretary at War ? In this stage of the business, the wound inflicted by Hamilton would have been laid bare before the public ; the friends of Adams would have considered it as a pointed affront on him ; and the friends of the candidates would have viewed it as a just compliment to their merits. During this controversy, parties would have rallied ; reflections would have increased with an electrical celerity ; the honour of Mr. Adams on one side, and the jealousy of Mr. Pinckney on the other, would have created a fermentation in the public mind, which could not easily be allayed ; the Essex junto would have erected their baneful crest, and the event would have been, if not a *civil war*, yet the inveteracy of passions would have fell but little short of such a catastrophe. The contest might have been so distressing, that the history of America would have furnished a datum whereby to calculate our political misfortunes. The contending parties being powerful, the United States might have commenced the sanguinary detail of war, from this inauspicious period. The nineteenth century might have begun its progress with garments rolled in blood, within the once peaceful shores of America. History, instead of being crimsoned with European controversies, might have opened a new page to describe the sanguinary scenes exhibited on the American theatre.

These recitals are not the whims of fancy, or the flights of imagination ; they are probabilities which no man can controvert ; and we have reason to thank heaven, that we are delivered from such apprehensions, under an administration so congenial with *uniform principles*.

These observations, gentlemen, are offered for your consideration—and the citizens have reason to rejoice, that the election has taken its present course—and provided “ THE PEOPLE ” are attentive to their administration, we may anticipate events the most salutary and propitious.

Thus, gentlemen, have I offered my sentiments on the *tendency* of your votes, in paying attention to an inconsistent nomination, and if they strike *your mind* with the same force they do mine, you must congratulate each other that you did not succeed in your election ; for Mr. Adams must have been the most miserable man within the United States, if chosen either President or Vice-President, under the patronage of the Essex junto. The writings of federalists, and the toasts we see drank, are but feeble specimens of what they would have done, provided this party had been brought once more into our public councils. “ May they henceforth rest from their political labours, and *may their works follow them.*”

---

## No. XXV.

## TO THOSE WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

THE ESSEX JUNTO being completely baffled in their views, and finding that all their arts and stratagems are defeated, have now become desperate, and are endeavoring to confound and perplex that government by *artifice*, which they could not subvert by *intrigue*. These men are now reduced to the most mortifying situation, in seeing themselves disappointed in their designs, and after anticipating the most glorious prospects, they cannot refrain expressing their chagrin in being arrested in the midst of their career.

Thus we observe the continued calumny in the presses devoted to their service. Every indecency of language and every opprobrious epithet are expressive of the malignity of their disposition. They have the impudence to charge the republican citizens as aiming solely to acquire *poss of honour and profit* ; when it is evident that a large proportion of these defamers are either enjoying places of profit or are constantly seeking some lucrative employment.

With what bare-faced arrogance must these persons presume to allege such motives to the citizens who have given their suffrages for Mr. Jefferson. The *substantial property* of this country is in favour of this patriotic gentleman by the present election. Their votes are not obtained by fraudulent means, in voting for one man, when another was evidently intended. Notwithstanding this une-



quivocal decision in their favour, yet this implacable faction are persisting in their nefarious schemes to throw the United States into perplexities. They have dared to call their opponents *disorganizers, enemies to the constitution*, and disposed to depreciate the public confidence in all matters respecting the *funds*, and other pecuniary establishments.

These are the charges brought by this faction against the friends of Mr. Jefferson. Let us then, fellow-citizens, see how far their actions correspond with their allegations.

Who are the disorganizers at the present moment ? Who are the men that talk about *overturning government* ? Are they not those who are pleading in favour of an hereditary President and Senate ? Are they not those who are calumniating the states which have given their suffrages for Mr. Jefferson ? If these persons are in favour of the constitution, why will they not allow the same right to others, which they claim themselves ? The constitution contemplates a free election for President and Vice-President, once in four years, and on this occasion every freedom is to be exercised by the respective states, to choose such men as are most agreeable to them. The mode adopted at the last election has been peculiarly favorable to Messrs. Adams and Pinckney, notwithstanding which, the return of votes has given the majority to Messrs. Jefferson and Burr. If this does not express the sentiments of the citizens, what method could be taken to give them a more decided avowal ? Massachusetts has taken the right from the people for the express purpose of securing Messrs. Adams and Pinckney ; and Pennsylvania have carried their projects to the utmost length to effect their purposes ; who then is to blame in this business ?

Though this is so evident, yet we daily observe the most gross abuse on the *public voice*. The vilest calumny is published against Mr. Jefferson, as they know that *he is the man* contemplated by the electors to fill the seat of presidency. To defeat *this purpose*, is now their great object. The Essex junto and their adherents, therefore, are the *disorganizers* ; they are the disturbers of the public tranquillity ; they are the men who are endeavouring to depreciate the public funds, to lessen the value of all pecuniary establishments, to create jealousy among the citizens, and to injure our national reputation in Europe. For this base end, they are describ-

ing our government as tending to a dissolution ; that property will be set afloat ; that our six per cent. and other public stocks are falling.

Ye holders of the public funds, what have you not to apprehend from these disorganizers ? How are you to receive your quarterly payments, if the confidence of the citizens in the government is thus blasted ? From whence do you expect your interest money, if this junto are to raise a distrust in the new administration ? If your stocks are to be *cried down* by this desperate party, who are the people to give stability to your property ?—*Will the junto help you in the day of adversity ?* If they convulse the government, will not your pecuniary interest be the first shaken in the controversy ? Instead, therefore, of joining this desperate clan of opposers, rather suspect their views and designs. It may be for their private emolument that confusion should arise. Individuals among them may be so plunged in arrears, (provided a strict examination into their accounts should take place) that their only security may lay in *burning the books*, and involving all public transactions in intricacy and perplexity. Such men, we may suspect are *afraid* to have things brought to light, and under their present embarrassments may be desirous to introduce every difficulty to prevent a critical investigation into their conduct.

The men who have been planning a war with France are not the friends to any class of *real American citizens*. In this state of things, if they had accomplished their purposes, the *stocks*, and every kind of LANDED PROPERTY must have fell a sacrifice. It would have been impossible to maintain the funds at their present estimation, as the public debt would have increased beyond the ability of the people to discharge it. The schemes of this junto were hostile to every man who held either public stocks or landed property, as war must have lessened the value of both. And it is further suspected, that many who are now clamorous against Mr. Jefferson are so involved in the banks, custom-house, &c. that they wish to balance their accounts by an annihilation of the government.

The utmost confidence, therefore, must be placed in the *new administration*. A war with France is now improbable, if not impossible. A system of ECONOMY will give stability to the funds, and appreciate the landed interest. The merchant will not be burdened with excessive duties to maintain a standing army and a clan of

idlers, who have too long lived on salaries much above their *service*, or *their merits*. ECONOMY is the great work of reformation :— The industrious are the worthy part of society, and the lazy drones who are basking either at home or *abroad*, under governmental patronage, ought to be put to a better employment. ECONOMY is the vital principle of a republic, and under the administration of Mr. Jefferson, we doubt not, the citizens will have reason to return thanks to heaven, that the “ snare is broken and that we have escaped.” A desperate, insidious, wicked faction are now discovered (emphatically styled the ESSEX JUNTO) and provided we keep such men from our councils, and remove them from their offices, the Republic of America will assume its national dignity. These are the disorganizers, and ought to be branded as such. Citizens of America, be firm ; be vigilant.

## No. XXVI.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE CLERGY AND PEOPLE,  
FROM DR. MORSE'S GEOGRAPHY.

DOCTOR MORSE, in his Geography, page 453, speaking of the clergy of *Connecticut*, makes this singular remark :—“ The clergy, who are numerous, and as a body very respectable, have hitherto preserved a kind of *aristocratical balance in the democratical government* of the State, which has *happily* operated as a check to the *overbearing spirit of republicanism*.”

This assertion, if *false*, is a charge which requires the consideration of the CLERGY : If *true*, the declaration is worthy the immediate consideration of the PEOPLE. If it is *false*, it is a libel on the “ *respectable* clergy” of Connecticut : If *true*, it is a subject in which the citizens are deeply interested.

In a republican government, it is an alarming idea, that an aristocracy is operating among the clergy to check the spirit of republicanism ; and the alarm is greatly increased, when the declaration is made by a man, who pledges the authenticity of his avowal by subscribing his name to the publication.

Doctor Morse's Geography is passing current through the United States. He is an author, who has obtained a reputation

(if not by the propriety of his writings, yet his *own assiduity* has given a circulation to them) which has overpowered many inaccuracies contained in various pages of his performances.

Doctor Morfe has taken peremptory ground. It is presumed, then, that he is willing to be responsible for whatever his Geography contains. If it is studied in our academies, public schools, &c. every article ought to be well authenticated. If our children are to be taught not only *geography*, but the *political principles which govern certain orders of men*, how careful should he be, that nothing is inserted but what will bear the strictest scrutiny.

By this statement, the question is reduced to a simple point,—do we wish that our children, by perusing Doctor Morfe's Geography, should be taught as a rudiment of education, “That the respectable body of clergy in Connecticut, are a kind of *aristocratical balance* in the democratical government of that state, and that they operate as a check to the *overbearing spirit of republicanism*?”

Will the clergy of Connecticut thank Doctor Morfe for this declaration? Do they wish to be considered as opposed to a *republican system* of government? Are they desirous to become an aristocratical check in the civil establishment of that state? Are church and state so allied among the free citizens of Connecticut, that the *clerical order* is introduced as an efficient branch of the administration? Does their constitution contemplate the *clergy* as part of the legislature, or have they a control over the “constituted authorities” established in their sovereignty?

What right has Doctor Morfe (while writing a Geography for his *personal emolument*) to bring into public view the clergy of Connecticut, as interfering in the civil departments of that Commonwealth? Who gave him an authority to represent this respectable order as an *aristocratical body*, and acting in opposition to the *republican principles* of their fellow-citizens? Who empowered him to denounce the freemen of Connecticut as exercising an *overbearing spirit of republicanism*? Or will the *sale* of his Geography (as it respects his *private interest*) compensate the respectable clergy of Connecticut for the *censure* thus thrown upon them?

While reading this remark of Doctor Morfe, a stranger would naturally suspect that the clergy of Connecticut had formed themselves into a civil phalanx: that instead of attending to the *duties of their profession*, they had associated as a body of politicians; that

they *voted* and *acted* in opposition to the legal authority of the state ; that they issued their veto or bulls to counteract the resolutions of the legislature ; that they forsook their pulpits, and commenced political missionaries ; in short, that the clergy had combined as an *ecclesiastical faction* to subvert the established principle of the government. If a *zealous republican* had dealt so freely with the Reverend Order, it might have been considered as an outrage on their patriotism, but when one of their own fraternity makes the avowal, it wears a more serious aspect.

Not being particularly acquainted with the clergy of Connecticut, I cannot pretend to say, how far the representation of Doctor Morfe may be *agreeable to them*. But this I am bold to say, that if any man in Connecticut had made the same indecent declaration against the *whole respectable clergy of MASSACHUSETTS*, they would have resented it as a most illiberal degradation of their clerical character. The clergy of this state would have received it as a gross reflection on their conduct ; and at their *annual convention* would have passed a severe reprimand on the officious author. The clergy of Massachusetts would have reprobated every suggestion that conveyed an idea *that they had formed an aristocratical balance, to check the spirit of republicanism*. They would have considered it as an affront on the *Reverend Order*, to be placed in such a degrading political view, and designated as subverters of the liberties of their country. If Doctor Morfe can take this freedom with the clergy of Connecticut, it is presumed that no man dare assume the same liberty with the clergy of Massachusetts. Though we have reason to think, that some individuals of the clerical profession are endeavouring to form an aristocratical balance, yet the clergy, *as a body*, we presume, are opposed to such a measure.

When Doctor Morfe was writing his Geography, and *hurrying it for the press*, he might flatter himself, that it was but of little consequence how he described particular orders of men. But what he says of the clergy of Connecticut is a charge of the highest magnitude. If this aristocracy is already formed in Connecticut, may we not suspect that it may have a more extensive operation ? Has not Doctor Morfe, by his injudicious observations, taken an effectual method to set the people of Connecticut against their ecclesiastical teachers ? Does he suppose, that the citizens will *reverence* their clergy as an *aristocratical body* ? Will they esteem them as

men, who are a *check* to the *spirit of republicanism*? Are not the people of Connecticut REPUBLICANS? If so, they must be opposed to an *aristocratical body*; and when they are told by Doctor Morfe, that the CLERGY ARE THIS BODY, will they not view them with jealousy, and endeavour to render them uneasy in their respective congregations?

What can have a greater tendency to destroy the cause of religion, than denouncing the *whole clergy of a state* as a *combined body of aristocrats*? A deist could not take a more effectual way to accomplish his purposes; and yet the *pious* Doctor Morfe is prejudicing the citizens of Connecticut against their clergy by such an opprobrious epithet. The PALLADIUM is bemoaning the progress of infidelity; the *New-England States* are particularly called upon to rally round the banner of religion; and yet this sage Doctor has come forward, and declared, that the clergy of one of these states, "*happily*" preserve an *aristocratical* balance, and check the spirit of republicanism. The Doctor, it must be allowed, shows some degree of jesuitism in his mode of expression; he says, "*an overbearing spirit of republicanism*. But who are the judges in this case? Are the clergy so far a branch of the government as to interfere in the laws? or have they such an influence as to control measures, after they are enacted by the legislature? Do they meet in conclave to *revise the laws*? or are they recognized as LORDS SPIRITUAL? Can they rally a *faction* to counteract the proceedings of the constituted authorities?—But, according to Doctor Morfe's statement, all these things are done by the Clergy, and that it is in their power to *check the spirit of republicanism*, as far as THEY THINK PROPER.

#### CITIZENS OF CONNECTICUT!

These remarks are made for your consideration. Permit me to ask you, whether Dr. Morfe is *right* or *wrong*? Is it a fact, that your clergy are an ARISTOCRATICAL BODY? Is it *true*, that they check the spirit of republicanism? Have they such a control over your councils, that they can say, hitherto shall you go in your republicanism, and no farther? Have you a bench of BISHOPS, or do your laws pass through the ordeal of a spiritual inquisition? If these are facts, we cannot but pity your situation: But *if they are not*, we expect that some severe censures will be passed on the man, whose arrogance has led him to give such a statement of your po-

litical vassalage. The YEOMANRY of Connecticut are too enlightened to be priest-ridden. The freedom of their constitution soars above a clerical control ; and though a man may acquire a few dollars by the sale of a geographical publication, yet the *honour of freemen* is too great a sacrifice not to expose his absurdities. The liberties of a people are too sacred to be sported with, and even priestly habiliments should never be a cover, too impenetrable for investigation and reprehension. The federal constitution has guaranteed a republican government to the respective states ; who then is the MAN that presumes to assert, that the clergy are forming an aristocracy to check this constitutional barrier ? If there is such a person, let him come forward and maintain his principles, and not impute to others, what he dare not himself openly avow.

---

## No. XXVII.

## FURTHER REMARKS ON DR. MORSE.

THE remarks on Old-South, in the PALLADIUM, carry strong traits, that the *Reverend Doctor* is the author ;—but when so high a compliment is paid to him, “ that every *gentleman*, who is friendly to the dissemination of useful knowledge, feels *indebted* to the industry and *talents* of Doctor MORSE for so *valuable a work*, as the Geography of his own country,” candour might forbid me to consider him as the trumpeter of his literary fame. But though candour may lay in her claim, yet we have been furnished with so many evidences of his scribbling propensity, I cannot suppose that any other person would *take the pains* to vindicate his political reputation.

I shall, therefore, consider the Doctor as the writer of the remarks on Old-South ; and, after he has complimented himself as a “ *man of talents*,” I am willing to allow him the same privilege with any other trader, who has an article to dispose of. His Geography is an article of sale ; and as such, it gives it an additional value, by stamping on the prefatory page the talents of the author. For we buy books for the improvement of the mind, as we buy “ Hamilton’s worm-destroying lozenges,” or any other medicine, for rectifying the human constitution. There never was a person

who published a nostrum, but what declared the inventor a man of talents, and that the medicine would cure almost every complaint to which the human frame was liable. Though I am willing to acknowledge that Doctor Morse has great merit as a compiler ; yet in books, as in medicine, the public will judge for themselves.

Doctor Morse, while endeavouring to apologize for his expression in his Geography, has persisted in his declaration, " that the sentiment is perfectly correct." He still persists in his avowal, " that the clergy of Connecticut have *hitherto* preserved a *kind of aristocratical balance*" ;—and how do they preserve it ? The Doctor tells us, " by preaching the pure doctrines of the gospel ; inculcating its moral precepts, and exemplifying them in their lives." —Thus, by the statement made by Doctor Morse, *the pure doctrines of the gospel ; its moral precepts, and walking agreeably to them, are aristocratical*. This is a new doctrine, for when Paul preached before Felix, he was not denounced as an *aristocrat* ; he was considered rather as a *madman*. When the disciples and apostles proceeded in their missions, it was not declared by the infidels that the *aristocrats* had come among them, but men who were " turning the world upside down." The pure principles of the gospel were never styled *aristocracy*, before Doctor Morse gave them this appellation :—In what instance did our Saviour give himself the character of an aristocrat ? On the contrary, he bore testimony against every thing that led to this distinction, or excited the vain exclamation, " *I am holier than thou.*"

The fact is, Doctor Morse has completely exposed his political principles, in his description of the clergy of Connecticut. It is conjectured, that he felt a disposition, in 1789, to give the clergy an *aristocratical preponderancy* in the civil institutions of the government ; but finding, at *this time*, that it will not do openly to avow his sentiments, he has recourse to an explanation, which strikes at the very foundation of the Christian system ; to strengthen his Geography, he weakens the Scripture. He has, in order to justify his mode of expression, been obliged to give a disgusting appellation to the pure doctrines of the gospel. He has declared it a correct sentiment, that preaching the pure doctrines of the gospel, inculcating its moral precepts, &c. is a *kind of an aristocratical institution*. Will *this kind of definition* help the cause of religion ? Will its ministers be received with alacrity, under all the apprehensions



annexed to this disgusting expression? Will the people become zealous to propagate the pure doctrines of the gospel, as an aristocratic establishment? Doctor Morse being thus reduced to an *explicit explanation*, as to his charge against the clergy of Connecticut, instead of acknowledging his error, has chosen rather to give an odious appellation to the doctrine of the gospel, than to depreciate his Geography, which contains such a severe censure on the respectable clergy of Connecticut.

Suppose Thomas Paine had made use of this opprobrious epithet, would not the clergy have considered it as an unfair representation of the tendency of the gospel? Would they not have reprobated the man who had attached such an unpopular idea to this sacred subject? The term aristocracy, is no way applicable to the mild, equitable principles of the christian religion. Its worst enemy could not introduce a word more injurious to its propagation. If aristocracy is the tendency of its establishment, will the people be zealous in extending its progress? Dr. Morse may be a warm advocate for religion, but if he means to get clear of his charge against the clergy of Connecticut, by throwing the odium of aristocracy on the pure doctrines of the gospel, the question is, whether greater injuries will not arise to the cause of religion, than benefit to the community by the sale of his Geography?

His ungenerous assertion, that I have "incessantly abused the clergy," "merits no other notice than a smile of contempt;" so far from attempting to injure their reputation, I have endeavoured to vindicate them from the stigma which his publication tended to produce. To be plain with the Doctor, I consider him, and a few others of the same vindictive disposition, as wounding the cause of religion beyond any body of men in the United States. He has exposed himself to ridicule in many of his sermons and newspaper publications; his story of the Ocean massacre is degrading to a minister of the gospel, especially when he has tarnished his integrity by not acknowledging his error.

From delicacy to *his profession*, I shall forbear commenting any farther on his remarks, as I might rouse the citizens of Connecticut to treat him with too poignant a severity. But his insinuation, that "this aristocracy of manners and virtue has been in a great degree preserved among the citizens of Connecticut, by the good

examples and moral inculcations of the clergy," is a high reflection on the people of that state. "The *respectable clergy* of Connecticut" will not thank him for this remark ; neither will the merchants or farmers of that Commonwealth respect him for this declaration. The clergy are too liberal to admit of such a degrading idea of their parishioners ; and the citizens are too enlightened to suppose that the clergy (*instead of their own good sense*) have prevented them from plunging into anarchy and disorganization.

As a friend to the Doctor, I would advise him to keep within his proper boundary ; he mistakes his talents if he thinks he can do his duty as a Clergyman, a Geographer, and a newspaper Editor ; any one of these employments is fully sufficient for a man of his literary endowments. It is best for him to make his election which of them he will pursue ; for depend on it, his inadequacies will appear more and more conspicuous if he prosecutes the whole of these vocations. If money is his object, let him correct his Geography ; if religion is his study, let him attend to his parish ; if politics are his pursuits, let him take a Printing-Office, and openly announce himself as the Editor. This is my advice, as a friend.

I must apologize to the *Reverend* Doctor, for omitting the word "*very* ;" it was wholly unintentional : But as it is of "*very*" little consequence, I am "*very*" willing, and "*very*" much gratified, in giving the *Reverend* Doctor all the advantages resulting from the omission.

I remain, his "*very*" devoted servant, &c.

## No. XXVIII.

### DOCTOR MORSE—AGAIN !!!

**H**UMANITY pleads so strongly in favour of Doctor Morse, that it would be cruel to pursue him any farther. He, or some friend for him, is obliged to come forward and declare, "that he has never been a writer *in the Palladium*." Is the vindication of his Geography so puerile, or the remarks on Old-South so ridiculous, that the reputation of the Doctor would suffer, if he should allow himself to be the author ? Are the publications in the *Palladium* so dishonourary, that a man must suffer in his literary reputation,

if he were recognized as the author ? Alas ! that the Palladium should so soon sink in the public estimation. After such a display of literary patronage, under which this paper was ushered into the world ; after so many private subscriptions to substantiate its establishment ; after being told that men of the first abilities were invited to furnish its lengthy columns with the rarest specimens of erudition ; after Dr. Morse had been peculiarly active in obtaining money from individuals, to establish this "*New-England Palladium*" ; is it possible, in less than two months, the Reverend Doctor should find it essential to his literary fame, to declare, that he has never been a writer in it ? Why are you thus explicit, Doctor ? Do you think it fair, after getting persons to subscribe, some a hundred, and some fifty dollars, thus to leave them in the lurch, and depreciate the paper with an avowal that you have nothing to do with it ? Certainly, Doctor, this is not doing as you would be done by. Do you suppose, that when the money was paid by the gentlemen to whom you applied for subscription, that they expected you would so soon have disowned their patronage ? One person, I understand, signed one hundred dollars, but if he had thought you would have denied having any thing to do with the paper, is it probable he would have been so lavish in his bounty ? The declaration appears ungenerous as it respects the subscribers, for it looks as if you were ashamed of the paper, though some have coaxed so much money from their pockets towards its establishment.

The evidences, however, are so strong, that Dr. Morse does furnish pieces for publication in the Palladium, that it is suspected the denial, though apparently explicit, somewhat partakes of a mental reservation. The writer says, "that Dr. Morse never has been a *writer in the Palladium*." This "*kind*" of evidence cannot be admitted, for it is out of the power of any person (excepting the Doctor himself) to make such a negative declaration. If the pieces were brought by another person, or written in another hand, yet no man can say positively that Dr. Morse was not the author. This declaration, therefore, goes for nothing. But I suspect further jesuitism still : the expression is, "Dr. Morse has never been a *writer in the Palladium*" ; neither is any other man a *writer in the Palladium* ; it is a *printed* not a *written* paper, and it may be declared with safety, that the Doctor's hand-writing

does not appear among the types of that paper. But will the Doctor positively say, that he never has been a *writer for* the *Palladium*? that he never furnished a piece for publication? If he declares this, he will say something; but at present the assertion wears a questionable aspect.

However, Doctor, for once be candid and generous; will you declare on the honour of a man, and on the *sanctity of a Christian*, that you have not, directly or indirectly, written *for the Palladium*. Equivocation and mental reservation are out of the question: say whether you have not furnished many publications, and don't be ashamed to tell the whole truth, even though your literary fame should suffer by the acknowledgment. Is it not a fact, that you spend many hours in the printing-office? Is it not a fact, that you applied to many of your clerical brethren for their countenance and support? If this be true, Doctor, why are you afraid to be considered as a writer? Has Old-South intimidated you? --Depend on it, nothing but honour and generosity will arise from this quarter; he will handle your publications with gentleness; if he is severe, yet it will be only the chastisement of a friend, who rather means to caution you in your conduct, than expose your imprudences. Your zeal has carried you beyond your proper boundary; as a Clergyman I esteem you; but as a Politician, I must honestly say, that you have done an injury to religion, and even exposed yourself to ridicule.

I shall now close *this controversy*, unless an unfair advantage is taken of my silence; in which case I may renew my observations.

Health and fraternity.

## No. XXIX.

IN ANSWER TO DR. MORSE, ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS.

AS subjects of much higher importance than *Dr. Morse's Illuminati*, &c. are now before the public, it requires an apology for noticing his elaborate observations. But, as the Doctor has given it an apparent solemnity by his prolixity, a few gentle remarks I hope will not be considered as improper.

The Doctor, with all the *humility* and *candour* of "a Minister of the gospel of peace," has styled his opponents "unprincipled men": Such an indecorous appellation does not favour of that christian spirit, which ought to characterize his profession. Charity is an appropriate attribute of religion, and it ill becomes a man to use such opprobrious language, who assumes the prerogative to *ASSIZE* himself the *standard of orthodoxy*.

My observations, on the paragraph taken from the Doctor's Geography, were principally intended to reprobate the idea, *that the "respectable clergy of Connecticut" were an aristocratical body*. The assertion, in my mind, conveyed a sentiment injurious to that worthy class of citizens. The remarks were introduced, not to injure the Doctor, but to give him an opportunity to *explain his meaning*. He has thought proper to be silent on the subject, but some friend in his behalf has made a feeble defence, and at the same time has indirectly suggested, that the Doctor has not written any thing in the *Palladium*, excepting advertisements and anecdotes.

The story of the Ocean massacre is not fully cleared up by the Doctor; for no person doubted that such a "*report*" prevailed; but, as a "minister of peace and *truth*," it was expected that when he found it was *false*, he would frankly have *confessed* the error of his assertion; that he would be as ready to *rectify his mistake*, as he was assiduous to *propagate the report* in his sermon. At least it was as incumbent on him to stand on the ground of veracity in this instance, as in that of Professor Ebeling's letter.

The wild, ridiculous story of *Illuminism*, I never pretended to investigate. This was *too dark* a business for my comprehension; but if the Doctor would condescend to publish the *real letter* which he received from Professor Ebeling, it is expected that *great light* would be thrown on this clouded subject.

Though I have never before noticed the controversy on Professor Ebeling's letter, yet after reading the laboured vindication of the Doctor, the following remarks naturally recurred from the perusal:

The *identical letter*, received by Dr. Morse, from Professor Ebeling, it is readily acknowledged, *was not the one published*; but will the Doctor say, that he had not *at the same time*, in his possession, a letter from this gentleman of the *same import*? If he had, I would ask him whether the mode, in which he *denied the letter publish-*

ed, had not a tendency to raise a doubt as to the *authenticity* of Professor Ebeling's opinion of Robison? And whether this "kind" of denial does not leave a *faint shadow of deception* on his part? Doctor Morse, in his letter to the editor of the Bee, (speaking of the letter published) says, "This I can, and do assure you, it is FALSE; I never saw *the letter you have published*, till I read it in your paper." Now, Doctor, I would ask you, whether this decisive language did merely carry in it a denial of the letter *being sent to you*, but whether it did not convey a strong idea that Professor Ebeling *had not written any letter whatever disapprobatory of Robison's book*? Further, the certificate declares, that "the abstract was *basely false and calumnious*." Such a positive denial gave a more serious appearance against the *facts of the letter*, than against the trifling mistake that it was *directed to you*.

The whole *merits* of this question, Doctor, rest on this single point, whether, *at the time* you declared the letter published to be FALSE, you had not in your possession a similar one from Professor Ebeling, and though the *letter published* might not contain every particular word, which could be found in the one you received, (the word "VERY," &c. might be omitted) yet whether it did not express the same in "*substance, scope and end*? The marrow of this cause, Doctor, lies in this inquiry, and ten lines in the paper in *answer to it*, would as fully satisfy the public, as the columns you have published.

You acknowledge, Doctor, that you received a letter from Professor Ebeling, in *July, 1799*, "in which he mentions having seen Robison and Barruel's books on the subject of Illuminism, and gives his opinion, and *the reasons of his opinion against the authenticity of these works*"; while the note you sent to the editor of the Bee, declaring the letter published to be "FALSE," is dated Dec. 3, 1799, five months after you acknowledge to have received Ebeling's letter. How then could the *letter be "false,"* even if a mistake was made, in saying it was sent to *Doctor Morse*, instead of the *Rev. Mr. Bentley*? The *contents of the letter*, as it respected Ebeling's "opinion, and the *reasons for his opinion*," were the subjects of controversy, not whether it were sent to *Doctor Morse*, or any other clerical character.

The *direction of the letter* to Doctor Morse, might be safely denied: but how could he undertake to say, that *the letter* was

“*false*” ? or how could any one for him say, that it was “*false and calumnious*,” when he had every reason to suppose the letter to be genuine, as he held one in his own hands containing similar sentiments ? The monosyllable “*to*” could not alter the merits of the letter ; it was true or false, not as directed “*to Doctor Morse*,” but in the validity of the opinion given of Robison by Ebeling ; wherein was the falsity or calumny, as it related to the essence and quintessence of the letter, whether the person who published it, said it was sent to you or any other person ? Robison’s book was a matter of public notoriety, and the public were pleased to know Ebeling’s opinion of it, and there could be no other calumny attached to Doctor Morse by this disclosure, than the difference of his opinion with Professor Ebeling’s. *Great men* in all countries, and in all ages have and will disagree, without the stigma of *calumny*, and I hope, Doctor, this will console you under the mortification of finding the *learned Ebeling* reprobating a book, which you so sedulously recommend.

The Doctor alleges, that it would be improper to publish a private correspondence. This may be a very honorary apology, but will the Doctor say, that he did not write to Professor Ebeling, in *expectation that he would approve the book* ; and provided he had been furnished with such a choice document, I would ask him, whether he would not have published it with avidity, to substantiate the belief of Illuminism ? Unfortunately, however, for the Illuminati votaries, the learned Professor reprobated the vagaries of Robison and Barruel, and therefore his letter was confined to a few confidential friends to lament their disappointment.

The writings of Robison and Barruel have long since been exploded by almost every literary character in Europe and America. It is discovered to be a mere trick to deceive the people. This being the fact, I am sorry that Doctor Morse should expose himself, by persisting to support such incoherent trumpery.

Instead of studying Robison and Barruel, it would be more becoming a Minister of the gospel to have recourse to the Bible, and discover the “*signs of the times*.” In this book, the Doctor may be led to more evangelical contemplations ; the *prophecies* and *revelations* might solemnize his mind to more judicious reflections than the extravagant reveries of these fanatics. Fleming, on the fulfilment of the Scriptures, is an author more adequate to the

purposes, as this divine has pursued the inquiry on scriptural principles. But, while Doctor Morse adheres to such rhodomontade as Robison and Barruel, and alarms the ignorant in his Fast Sermons, with the ridiculous stories of knight-templars, &c. and excites the public attention with a number of outlandish names, as conspirators against religion, he weakens his professional energies, and rather appears in the station of a bigot, than in the dignified department of a man of literature.

Religion does not require such paltry aid ; for HE, who has declared that the " gates of hell shall not prevail against it," will secure it from falling a prey to a few knight-templars, or a combination of illiterate Germans. The alarm ought to subside in the Doctor's mind, for in this Commonwealth we have upwards of five hundred learned and respectable clergymen, (under the guidance of the SUPREME BEING,) in opposition to the combined efforts of such antagonists. If we doubt of victory, we depreciate (what I am unwilling to allow) the *abilities of the clergy*. Why then is the Doctor describing the people as running headlong to destruction ? If the people in general do not reflect on the *clergy*, is it not ungenerous for any clergyman to reflect on the people ? Wherein do the people appear so disposed to injure the clergy ? Are they not as *well paid*, as *well fed*, and in general as *highly estimated* as ever ? While the clergy are treated well by the people, why should any man suggest in his century sermon, " that before the end of this century, the *majority of the people* of America will be so corrupt as to dislike the restraints of religion ?" If this should be the unhappy state of our country, I am afraid it will arise from the imprudent conduct of a few clerical zealots, who are *bewildering* their societies with *politics*, instead of *enlightening* them with *religion*. Can it be supposed, at this enlightened age, that the vagaries of fanatics will pass for gospel truths ? And if a clergyman will sport the sacred scriptures upon the frenzies of Robison and Barruel, he must expect to excite ridicule, instead of respect. Notwithstanding these gloomy forebodings, I believe that real *unadulterated christianity* will prevail in America, and those of the clergy who walk in the path described by their MASTER, will be duly honoured and revered.

If *some* of the clergy have weakened their influence, on whose shoulders does the blame lie ? If the Doctor considers himself as undervalued in public estimation, let him reflect on his own con-



duet ; he would never have been a subject of animadversion, if he had kept within his clerical profession, but when he overleaped the bounds of decency in denouncing men as Jacobins, Illuminati, &c. he might naturally suppose that such censures would not be patiently borne, though sanctified with the appellation of fast sermons, or pulpit discourses. A clergyman *should respect himself*, if he means to acquire it from others. A teacher of gospel truths should not presume to denounce and anathematize as a political dictator ; or print sermons with marginal notes, which afterwards prove false : If he will take this responsible part, he places himself on an equality with his fellow-citizens, and at once strips himself of his ecclesiastical habiliments. If, instead of a clergyman, he assumes the politician, he must expect to take his lot in the scuffle.

As the Doctor has styled his opponents "*unprincipled men*," he must excuse the liberty taken in these remarks ; and though I would not retort in such uncharitable language, yet when a man assumes too high a prerogative, a gentle reprimand may prove serviceable.—Health and fraternity, Doctor.

## No. XXX.

## ON PRESIDENT JEFFERSON'S SPEECH.

WHILE reading the speech of Mr. Jefferson, every American must feel an indignation that within the United States there are men so lost to every honorary principle, as to calumniate a character so truly amiable and respectable. The contrast between the exalted sentiments of this patriot and statesman, and the base detraction vented by his enemies, must strike every considerate citizen with the most forcible conviction, that malignity and defamation are the leading passions of his opponents ; while *he* exhibits the benevolence, candour, and magnanimity of a Christian, patriot, and philosopher, his enemies have portrayed him in all the detestable qualities of infidelity, immorality, and atheism.

While his opponents have been assiduous to destroy his reputation, by the foulest epithets of detraction, *he* has risen superior to their calumny, and, instead of condescending to "return

railing for railing," has given strong evidence of the magnanimity of an honest heart, and an exalted mind, over the deformities attached to a polluted temper and disposition.

FELLOW-CITIZENS ; while reading the speech of President Jefferson, pause at every period, and recollect, that this is THE MAN who has been held up to public view as the object of universal detestation. While contemplating the sublimity of the sentiments ; the eloquence of diction ; the candour, and conciliating strains, which adorn every paragraph, reflect, that *these are the words of a man* who has been denounced as the destroyer of government, the subverter of religion ; the demoralizer, the deist, the atheist ; and whose name has been profaned, as the LEADER of a banditti to overthrow government, and dissolve the bands which unite and harmonize society.

Ye ministers of the gospel ; ye *individuals* who have anathematized him from the sacred desk, how must shame cover your faces, while perusing this specimen of his political, and religious integrity ! He now stands unmasked before the public, and with the purity of *his own signature*, announces himself an advocate for RELIGION : That religion, which places mankind on the basis of equal rights ; that undisguised conduct which designates the *real christian*, from the imposing *hypocrite* : An enemy to the persecuting spirit of bigotry, but a friend to that benign temper which secures the happiness of society, and establishes the sacred doctrines of the gospel on a foundation too permanent to be shaken by zealots, or sanguinary fanatics. He displays that mildness and moderation, which have too rarely been found in those who have assumed the right of judging on his principles, and denouncing his conduct. While you have calumniated him, HE has scorned to retort in the language of reproach, but with that charity which is the ornament of christianity, enforces with a mildness of persuasion, those doctrines which you have charged him as violating ; from henceforth then, be silent. Let your reproaches cease ; convince the world that you are " indeed, and in truth," what you profess to be ; instead of reviling, acknowledge your misconduct ; give some specimen of your benevolence, by your works ; for as men of honour, and as christians, you must feel a *consciousness* of your error ; and thus convicted, you must confess, that the most permanent trait of

repentance, is a confession of your manifold offences. This is a christian regimen of honesty and contrition.

Every class of citizens must feel a pride, when they peruse a speech fraught with such classical erudition ; such propriety of sentiment ; such unaffected evidences of patriotism and integrity. The character of an American assumes a dignified deportment in the literary and political world, when its Chief Magistrate displays a character so sublime and majestic ; the great principles of our government are brought within the comprehension of every individual ; it is not a summary of our Constitution, but a PERFECT SYSTEM, so completely condensed, that it exhibits in one view all the vital organs of its existence. The man who studies this speech cannot be ignorant of the essential qualities of a free government ; it is a lesson which should be early learnt to our children, as containing those rudiments, which ought to direct not only the statesman in his duties, but instruct each citizen in the preservation of his rights. Solon as a law-giver is immortalized, but Jefferson as a commentator on the American Constitution, stands in a more permanent attitude. The doctrines which he inculcates, are familiar to republicans ; they have ever been the creed of those, who have been falsely designated jacobins and disorganizers.

The comprehensiveness of his mind is conspicuous in the minute details of those essential principles of our government, which ought to direct its administration. They are compressed within such precise limits, as to enforce them on the memory, and expressed with such classical elegance, as to charm the scholar with their rhetorical brilliancy. This is the peculiar happiness attached to Mr. Jefferson's literary performances. His Notes on Virginia are strewed with flowers selected from the parterre of the Belles Letters, while the DECLARATION OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE exhibits the sublimity of his sentiments, and will forever remain a monument of the immensity of his talents.

It must be allowed, that the licentiousness of the press has been extended in its utmost latitude in calumniating Mr. Jefferson ; but far from touching this palladium of public liberty, he avows his sacred attachment to its freedom. HE is not *afraid* to trust his conduct to the inspection of his fellow-citizens : neither is he desirous to wrest the PEN from the hands of freemen, and to rivet *shackles* in its place. Conscious rectitude preserves his confidence.

He readily submits his actions to uncontrolled investigation. His own bosom is the tribunal, and integrity presides as an impartial judge to confound his accusers.

This being the real character of Mr. Jefferson, how mortified and how abashed must his calumniators be, if they retain one spark of manly reflection ! How must those feel, who in *private caucusses* have vilified this exalted and virtuous citizen—who never *dare* openly to avow what they privately asserted—who have exerted themselves in opposing the election of Mr. Jefferson, contrary to the apparent voice of the people—who have shewn a rancour of temper (unbecoming even the character of a gentleman) through the whole progress of the late election—who have quitted the fair ground of argument, and screened themselves under the mask of hypocrisy—who have endeavoured to injure Mr. Jefferson, among the serious and well disposed, when the conduct of many of them has been discordant to every principle of honour, religion and morality ! Such is the system pursued against every patriot who has attempted to counteract the plans of an inveterate faction. Such is the process against Mr. Gerry and General Heath, and while this “JUNTO” can prosecute their wicked designs with any prospect of success, they will never “cease from troubling,” neither will this banditti “be at rest.” Let the magnanimity of the republicans be conspicuous in the treatment of their enemies ; but while we exercise our benevolence, let us guard against their insidious and deceptive stratagems. Let us shew a superiority over *their reign of terror* ; but instead of trusting to their repentance, let us put it out of their power to renew their subtleties—remember, “the tyger crouches before he leaps.”

## No. XXXI.

### THE MEANS TO LESSEN TAXES.

THE people of America are peculiarly attached to *Liberty* and *Property*. Persecuted in England by the arm of tyranny, they sought an asylum in this country for the enjoyment of their political and religious principles. After experiencing the sanguinary disposition of the government of Britain, they became tenacious

of those rights which they had acquired by their emigration. With a laudable jealousy they watched over the conduct of their magistrates, and in every instance were alive to all those tender emotions which naturally arise in the minds of men, who had fled from persecution.

The cold, unfeeling temper of those who were in league with the British during our revolutionary conflict : the apathy of those individuals who were within the lines of the enemy,—can speak with a peculiar indifference on the fears and apprehensions of the people. They can express their surprise, that the citizens are alarmed, or that they should distrust the intentions of those who are appointed to administer the government ; but from the first settlement of the country, it has been our misfortune to experience the worst of evils, from the hands of men, *who made the highest professions of friendship*. Who would have thought that Hutchinson was planning the ruin of America, under that courtly mask of cordiality which so peculiarly distinguished his character ? He was the idol of the *Clergy*, as *hypocrisy* was the coat of mail under which he attempted to render himself invulnerable.

Far be it from me, to censure any *pre-eminent* character of our late administration ; but if we examine the measures adopted for a few years past, it cannot but excite suspicions which are hard to be suppressed. Who are the authors of our troubles I will not pretend to say, but that we are in *difficulties* is too evident to be disputed. That there has been a party, devising “*ways and means*” to bring us into a war with France and an alliance with England is declared by Aristides. The conduct of individuals, in *too many instances*, has given a sanction to such a declaration. Every *aggravation* has attended their representations, as they related to *France*, and every *palliative* as connected with *England* ; while we have torn ourselves asunder from France by a *Non-Intercourse*, we have as anxiously renewed our connexion with Britain ; while we have resented, with all the rage of malignity, the violations of our commercial rights by the *French*, we have *passively* surrendered our neutral privileges to the arbitrary decisions of the *English*.

If this country had only experienced the effects of *wrong judgment*, and the mischiefs could be as easily rectified as the sentiments could be retracted, we might overlook the injudiciousness of those

who have been the authors of our difficulties ; but a HEAVY DEBT is contracted, and the present and future generations must become “*tributary*” to discharge it. If we could *discharge our debt* as easily as we could *disband our army*, the evil would be remedied without any essential inconvenience. While reflecting on this subject, remember, fellow-citizens, *we are to pay for our folly* ; every dollar expended must come from the pockets of *The People*.

During the debates in the convention on the adoption of the federal constitution, the duties arising from impost were thought adequate to all the essential purposes of our government, also for the payment of our foreign and domestic debt. The people were led to anticipate a cheap and energetic administration under the operation of this new system ; but, strange to relate, within about twelve years, *in a state of peace*, the most powerful resources of revenue are called into action ; *Impost, Excise, Stamp Duties, Land and House Tax*, and to cap the climax, *a Loan at the enormous premium of eight per cent.*

Such has been the effect of the late administration ; and can any man say that *prosperity* has attended this country, when such an immensity of taxes have arisen under its operation ? Who is to blame, is not *at present* my inquiry ; some future numbers may be more explicit on this subject ; but I can with confidence ask, whether any man had reason to suppose, that within so few years, the debts of the country would have called for such financial exertions ? Every base system of speculation has been prosecuted ; the artful designing knave has preyed on the distresses of the unfortunate ; and a few men have been able to acquire a profuseness of fortune, while the industrious part of the community are burdened with excessive duties to furnish their quarterly interest.

It is evident, that the ECONOMY recommended by Mr. Jefferson was not fully practised during the late administration ; for if it had, the necessities of this country could not have demanded such excessive expenditures. The treasury department has been obscured in mystery ; it is so inexplicable, that one man will assert, we have *lessened* the public debt, while another will as confidently maintain that it has *increased* millions ; whether it has *increased* or *lessened* is an important consideration. It might reasonably be expected that the debt would have been nearly extinguished by the respective sources of revenue. The people have been paying, for a number

of years back, every species of taxes, and yet they remain uncertain, whether we are not *more in debt* than before they made their payments. The extravagance in the expenditures of public money is generally allowed to exceed even European countries ; our trifling *navy*, it is supposed, has cost the United States four times as much as the same force in any other nation ; the *army* was a wanton lavishment of public money, and a most egregious imposition on the United States. Millions have thus been sported with in various channels ; Algerine tribute, grants for carrying into effect a British treaty, expenses of foreign ministers, and, above all, that *mausoleum* of folly and extravagance the Federal City. While our money is thus profusely squandered away, can we expect to discharge our debts, even though our taxes should increase four-fold ? Through the agency of personal patronage, the benefits of this extravagance have been confined within about one hundred families within the United States.

The state of the TREASURY is of the highest importance ; an investigation of the financiering system, receipts and expenditures and the respective items which have exhausted the supplies as rapidly as they were furnished. These are particulars which call for the critical eye of the new administration, and if the documents are not *burnt*, it is hoped that a just statement will be made ; that the people should be informed how their money is spent, and what is the remaining balance of their debts. A few men have enjoyed the advantages of these extravagances, but the burdens on commerce, agriculture, and manufactures press hard on the industrious part of the community, and begin to excite disagreeable sensations. Some other sources of revenue must be adopted, for it is unreasonable that the whole weight of an extravagant system of expenditure (which has principally enriched a particular class of men) should be laid on the *mercantile, agricultural, and manufacturing* branches. Let those who have experienced the " *blessings of the public debt,*" bear their proportion of the burden ; common sense requires an equalization of taxes ; the industry of a country ought not to be the sole object of taxation ; affluence and indolence have as broad shoulders to sustain the ponderancy.

On the establishment of peace, how are our YOUNG MEN to acquire a mercantile subsistence, if commerce is cramped with excessive duties ? How are the manufacturing and agricultural

branches to be supported, if every tradesman and farmer are borne down by exorbitant taxes? But whatever may be the distresses arising from future taxation, Mr. Jefferson cannot be answerable for them, as the debts for which he is to make appropriation were contracted during a former administration. His *economy* would have prevented them; but the errors of those who formerly had the lead in the financial departments, have brought a debt upon us, which will require the most accurate arrangement justly to liquidate.

The money departments are the great essential points, to which the present administration must be directed; an able and *industrious* financier is the great requisite of our government. When the people *understand* their public accounts, and when *economy* is practised in expending the money, and *each class of citizens bear their proportion*, a general confidence will pervade the community; but distrust will ever subsist, while money concerns are involved in clouds and darkness. The Americans are ever ready to support government, but they are equally desirous to know how their money goes.

Under Mr. Jefferson's administration, we expect an open, explicit statement of all pecuniary transactions; and there is the highest expectation, that such a man will be found, who will furnish not only the amount of debt, but recommend such "*ways and means*," as to put it in the power of the people, *honourably and equitably* to discharge it. We wish to pay our debts, but the support of *naval agents*, with a long train of *hangers-on*, in various departments, are burdens which were never contemplated by the people, on the adoption of the federal constitution. The constitution was made for the people, and not the people for the constitution; or, in other words, it ought to be administered in such a manner, as that the people should not be oppressed under it.

## No. XXXII.

### A PUBLICK DEBT, A PUBLICK EVIL.

THE prosperity of a country, and the prosperity of an individual must be calculated on the same principles; the same standard



which determines the accuracy of one, equally decides the validity of the other. Mankind are too apt to confound their ideas in judging on particular subjects ; more especially when speaking of *government*, they soar into the regions of mystery, and inconsiderately adopt the false doctrines of designing politicians, that it is a science too intricate and perplexed for common apprehension—the more abstruse and unintelligible the administration, the more “ stupendous the system” of wisdom which guides and directs those who govern.

But this is false reasoning ; upon this ground, the absurd doctrine, that “ a public debt is a public blessing,” is founded. It is impossible, that such a gross sentiment should be inculcated, if the people would exercise the same common sense on this question, as they do in the general concerns of life. A public debt must, in its consequences, create public taxes ; taxes must be collected from the people, and those who pay them must inevitably feel their ultimate tendency and pernicious effects.

What can be the difference between a nation and an individual ? Do not the same conclusions follow in one case as in the other ? If a private citizen is distressed by his debts, if he is exposed to many difficulties from the multiplicity of demands upon him, why should we suppose that a nation may not equally experience the operation of such embarrassments ?

This appears plain reasoning ;—but unfortunately for nations, an opposite doctrine is inculcated ; and even in America, an attempt has been made to instil this absurdity, as the test of political orthodoxy. It has been so far considered as the pivot of *federalism*, that the man who presumed to speak of the public debt, or recommended economy, has been stigmatized a jacobin, and exposed to every reflection which could injure his political reputation. In short, extravagance in public expenditures appears to have been systematically contemplated as the mark of national happiness and prosperity ; and though this chimerical mode has been secretly adopted by individuals, yet the project was too absurd to be openly divulged ; for while the plan was intended to increase the public debt, the citizens have been flattered that it was annually decreasing. But that the public debt has increased, cannot be controverted ; for if this had not been the fact, how is it

possible that the augmentation of taxes should so rapidly have taken place ? It either proves that we have expended our resources needlessly, or that the debt had kept pace with the call for taxes. The reasoning to be drawn from the increase of taxes is, that the demands on the government are equal to the demands on the people ; and this being granted, it follows that the *original debt* was within the revenue arising from *import*, but that the augmentation requires an excise, stamp-duties, land-tax, and an eight per cent. loan, to cancel the arrearages.

We may talk about the *decrease* of the public debt as long as we please ; financiering legendom may perplex the statements from the treasury department ; Mr. Harper may write to his constituents that our pecuniary affairs are in a prosperous situation ; but when the people find, that all the resources of the country are brought into operation, and that our public credit demanded eight per cent. to support it, they cannot be so lost to the estimation of pounds, shillings and pence, as to deceive themselves by fictitious calculations. The money, raised from various sources, ought to have diminished the debt by this time ; and it is but a poor consolation to be told by a few speculators, that we are *not more in arrears* than when we only paid the trifling duties of import.

It would be highly satisfactory to the people of the United States, to have laid before them the whole revenue, arising from the respective taxes and loans, from the first year after the revenue system was established, to the 3d of March, 1801. Should this be done, I believe the people would be astonished at the magnitude of the amount. From this statement, the citizens would be able to judge what have been their exertions in support of the government, and from this document they could ascertain how far the revenue might have been applied to discharge the public debt. This statement would at once open the eyes of the people ; and when they looked at the amount, the object would strike them with wonder and surprise. But the misfortune is, the treasury accounts have hitherto been involved in mystery ; there has been such a perplexity attending these communications, that but few men knew, after they had perused them, the real state of the business. In short, it has been so intricate, that in one circle, we should hear them boasting of the decrease of our national debt, and in another deploring its augmentation.

But if the whole revenue was explicitly declared, and the expenditures were as clearly stated, the people at large could as accurately judge, *what they had paid and what had become of the money*, as the ablest financier and the most plodding negotiator on the continent. This would be bringing our financial projects to a clear, defined point, and the resources of the country would give an evidence to the world, of the *immense abilities* of the United States in the support of government.

Mr. Jefferson being introduced to the chair of government, by the *republican* citizens of the United States, in vindication of his administration, it is hoped that such a statement will be made. The people will then see, what has hitherto been done, and if their taxes continue, that it is in consequence of previous engagements. If a debt is contracted by a former administration, it is not Mr. Jefferson's fault ; but the fulfilment of former contracts is indispensable on his part. Those, then, who sneeringly observe, that the republicans expect no taxes under Mr. Jefferson's administration, are to remember that the debt was contracted in the days of his predecessor.

The citizens of America are peculiarly fond of knowing how their money goes ; they are ready to pay their taxes, but at the same time are anxious to pry into the appropriation of them. Like honest men, they are desirous to answer all *necessary and legal demands*, but it is a *New-England fashio*n to examine accounts with a critical acuteness. Millions of dollars are large sums, and when they come from the pockets of the people, they feel a satisfaction in knowing their direction. If they are fairly expended, they are not disposed to murmur, but if they go under the idea that "a public debt is a public blessing," it is apt to make them jealous of the propriety of the principle. They love their country, and they love their money ; they are not fond of pageantry, and not willing to pay taxes, just to gratify the pride of men, who vainly imagine that the people *honour themselves* by paying for their extravagances.

The economy recommended by President Jefferson is the key-stone of republicanism ; this is the consummation devoutly to be wished by the republican citizens of the United States. If this principle had been strictly adhered to, I am persuaded the revenue already raised would have nearly extinguished the publi

debt. But the poison which has been infused into our government, has given a baneful tendency to corrupt the vital organs of the administration ; it has raised a few to eminence, and thrown a heavy debt on the bulk of the citizens. A false, deceptive appearance of prosperity has bewildered the public mind ; but when peace takes place, and the immense demands from the banks, custom-houses, &c. are cancelled, these films which now obscure the sight will drop from our eyes, and we shall not only *see*, but *feel* the effects of our political credulity and folly.

---

## No. XXXIII.

### ON THE ABUSE OF FEDERALISM.

IT is worthy of remark, to observe the peculiar efficacy of the term "*federalism*," as connected with the stratagems and designs of a particular description of men. It has for many years past been used as a *charm*, to substantiate the propriety of character, both as it respects religion and politics. It has also had its operation in the *fashionable circles*, being considered as a general passport of *good-breeding*, and a substantial badge of virtue and politeness. Under this delusive impression, the YOUNG MEN considered an avowal of these principles as the most convenient introduction to the company of the *bon ton*, and inconsiderately adopted those political sentiments which have a tendency to promote the interest of *British factors*, to their injury ; for it is a fact, that the leading men, who are now in favour of those measures which have been pre-eminently styled *federalism*, are the identical persons who were the most boisterous some years ago to destroy the very system they are now pretending to support. If this observation is denied, a full proof will be given, and the names of the individuals mentioned. The young Americans have been egregiously imposed on, in this political controversy, and some future numbers will be appropriated to undeceive them.

This false description of *federalism* was the test even of *ecclesiastical* orthodoxy. However pious, exemplary, and attentive to the duties of his profession, the clerical character has too often been tried by the *federal touchstone*. However devout in the dis-

charge of his functions ; however kind and charitable in his conduct, yet *federalism* was “the pearl of great price,” without which, no man could expect the affection of his parishioners, or the esteem of his fellow-citizens. If the clergyman could obtain the *role d’équipage* of *federalism*, he might pass current as a saint of the first magnitude, even though the general tenour of his behaviour was not strictly conformable to that modest deportment, which designates the disciple of his heavenly Master. If he neglected the duties of his profession ; imposed on the credulity of his parishioners ; published sermons containing the grossest falsehoods ; or endeavoured to palm on the public the most chimerical absurdities, yet *federalism* shrouded him from those censures which justice, and even Christianity demanded.

How many worthy characters have been calumniated, whose life and conversation were conformable to every moral principle ! whose behaviour, in the various departments of life, has in no instance been impeached with any *specific criminality* ! How often have we seen abuse and detraction heaped on them, as the most abandoned in society, because they exercised the right of freemen, or presumed to differ from those, who monopolized the appellation of *federalists* ! This intolerance has pervaded almost every circle in the community, and the reputation of men has been repeatedly sacrificed, at the shrine of party, with the most wanton barbarity. I would not be thought unjustly censorious, but the validity of these remarks is submitted to the candid decision of an enlightened public.

However honest the dealings of the merchant ; however punctual in the discharge of his engagements ; however industrious the tradesman in his occupation, yet his *good name* was no longer secure from defamation than he became the sycophantic approver of particular men and measures, or *dared* to think for himself in any matters in which the honour or prosperity of his country was involved. Like the Jews of old, the cry was, “*away with him, away with him*—he is not Cæsar’s friend.”

This infatuation of the term *federalism* was so powerful, that it nearly established an order of nobility among us. Under this title, the dishonest have oftentimes risen superior to the man of integrity ; a certain *hauteur* prevailed in the deportment of some who were dignified with this appellation. Many, whose credit

would scarcely pass the ordeal of an hour, would assume a right to incur a debt of thousands, and if *requested* to discharge it, would think their plea of *federalism* was as prompt payment, as a check on the bank. Some even considered it as an *honour to a jacobin*, to have their name on his books, and the delay of payment was often conceived as an indulgence to prolong his respectability. Like a Scotch *laird*, they thought it a great *condescension* to be a *debtor* to the canaille, or vulgar.

In the fashionable circles, *federalism* was the Alpha and Omega, it was the visiting card to the self-created nobles and noblesse; it was the wardrobe from whence the habiliments of elegance and taste were selected; it was the garment, which adorned the modern Chesterfields, and without which a man was oftentimes exposed to be bound hand and foot, and turned into outer darkness.

Thus the abuse of terms has been rendered subservient to party purposes. The times have been such, that a man required a strength of *nerves* as well as a strength of *principles*. The attack of federalism has been so violent and outrageous, that every faculty of the human mind has been assailed to enforce its establishment—calumny and ridicule, personal assault and private detraction, have alternately been used to intimidate and confound those who exercised, not only the right of judgment, but the right of conscience. A system of terror of the most malicious and vindictive nature has been prosecuted, and the freedom of citizens has nearly been denied to every one, who did not bow their knee at this altar of imposition.

The term *federalism* has been grossly violated; it has been made a stepping-stone to promote an interest, opposed in most instances to the fundamental principles of the federal constitution.—Federalism has been abused in its real, appropriate signification; it has, as it relates to many, been nothing more than toryism in masquerade. Under this deceptive mask, every enemy of our revolution has rallied; there is not one old tory but what has styled himself a federalist; in all our political controversies, the tories have assumed this infallibility of denomination. If an alien-act was passed, the tories approved the measure—if the liberty of the press was violated, the tories were vociferous for its most rigid operation—if a citizen was confined in goal, or subjected to heavy fines, under the rigour of the Common Law of England, the tories

applauded the infliction—if a standing army was raised, the tories recommended its continuance—if the people were burdened with taxes, the tories hailed the augmentation as the wisest administration of government—if Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, Mr. Gallatin, Mr. Lincoln, Gen. Dearborne, or even the venerable Samuel Adams, were calumniated, the tories were assiduous in aggravating the scurrility—if an attempt was made to involve us in a war with France, and an alliance with England, the tories were the most active to propagate every vain story to urge on the destructive system—if the President sent commissioners to France to renew our friendship, the tories reprobated his conduct in terms the most degrading :—in short, federalism was the watch-word, which operated as the charm to destroy all the vital republican principles of our constitution, and to bring the United States to the brink of disunion. The abuse of federalism, therefore, has bewildered the people. The enemies of our country have taken to themselves an appellation, which really and essentially belongs to those whom they have styled jacobins. The controversy is not confined to words, but to principles ; the republicans, (falsely styled jacobins) have always been the substantial supporters of the Federal Constitution ; they have been anxiously disposed to have it administered upon those principles which first gave it existence ; they are opposed to every measure which leads to extravagance, and which gives a power into the hands of the *few* to depress the *many*.

The speech of President Jefferson, as it relates to the administration of government, is the political creed of the republicans ; the rights of the citizens, both in their political and religious capacity are expressed in language consonant to the feelings and sentiments of a free people.

While thus describing the pernicious tendency of the term federalism, as operating for many years past, I would not be thought to explode the propriety of its adoption. Federalism is a prominent article in the American compact ; it is not a deceptive quality to answer party purposes, but a defined principle, which must ever invigorate the whole system of our government. The constitution lives and moves by its vitality—it is the locks of the American Sampson ; but while we contemplate its efficacy, let us not be led away by the hollow sound issuing through the caverns from whence, during our revolution, the hoarse murmurs

of our enemies proceeded. These false-termed federalists are sapping the ground on which our happiness is placed ; they are attempting to render the respective states jealous of each other ; they are trying their skill at dividing the Southern from the Northern States. The "NEW-ENGLAND PALLADIUM" is brought into view, as if to rally the parties under territorial distinctions. Publications have often disgraced those papers which assumed the federal title, to urge a division, and the election of the President has been denounced as the overbearing preponderancy of southern slaves. All these appearances forbode some deep project to shake the foundation of the federal constitution ; they appear systematically pursued, and the opprobrious epithets on our Executive, which are daily published, we have reason to fear are precursors to the fatal catastrophe.

"*We are all federalists,*" says the President ; that is, *every real friend to America* is in reality a friend to the harmony and union of the respective states. Let us, then, fellow-citizens, rally round our constitution, and maintain its *federal features*—let us scan the designs of men, who, with specious pretences, have courted the smiles of *federalism*, but who wish to violate the chastity of our patroness in their unhallowed embraces. The *real republicans* are the protectors of her honour, and under the wise and benign management of our constituted authorities, the enemies of our future prosperity, we trust in God, will be baffled.

The foregoing observations are not made to excite any unreasonable jealousies, or to create a spirit of party animosity ; but in order to prevent the *continuance of disunion* in our public affairs, it is necessary to know the *source of division*. This false appropriation of federalism is the *cause* of all our difficulties, and the Essex junto have taken an undue advantage by styling themselves "exclusive federalists" ; a wound which had so long been festering, ought to be probed to the bottom, and when we understand the *cause* of complaint, we can easily apply the remedy.



## No. XXXIV.

## ECONOMY.

SPECULATIVE subjects are liable to endless controversy. But there are axioms, both in politics and religion, to which the mind admits of no dissent—the most prominent of which are, the adoration of the SUPREME BEING, an adherence to our Constitutions, and a patriotic attachment to the freedom, sovereignty and independence of our country. These are tenets which baffle all opposition, and are the unequivocal tests of religious, moral, and social rectitude.

In politics a variety of opinions may be promulgated and enforced; honest men may differ as to the particular mode of administering the government, but there is one *radical principle*, which all the sophistry of statesmen can never eradicate. The principle which I allude to, is ECONOMY. It is the blood of the body politic—it is the stamina which invigorates the social organs, and gives animation to all the movements by which they are directed. It is the alpha and omega of a republican government, and the warrantee which secures the welfare and happiness of a people.

ECONOMY in government, is like *charity* in religion. It is the cardinal virtue, and while we enumerate all the pleasing characteristics of a prosperous administration, we must finally conclude, that *the greatest of these is ECONOMY*.

The “*modern philosophy*,” that “a public debt is a public blessing,” is equally as absurd, as if a man should say, that “private vices are public benefits; and a magistrate should be as reprehensible in endeavoring to augment the national debt, in order to increase the happiness of the country, as a minister of the gospel to disseminate vice to promote the cause of christianity.

Extravagance in public expenditures is the “*tare among the wheat*,” and a farmer may as well expect to reap a plentiful harvest with his soil overrun with noxious weeds, as a government to hope for prosperity, from a profuse lavishment of its pecuniary resources. The same simple principles are as applicable to *nations* as to *individuals*: and though a contrary doctrine has been ad-

vanced in England and America by "*modern Philosophers*," yet "*common sense*" revolts at the folly and tendency of the sentiment.

From the above plain positions, I am authorised to draw these conclusions, viz. that the *finances* of this country, at this early period, ought not to extend to the *utmost abilities* of the people, but should be kept within those rational bounds, which, *in a time of peace*, are adequate to an *economical administration* of the government ; and the accounts should be so clearly stated to the citizens, as that they might know to what purpose their money has been appropriated. If we had pursued this method, is it probable that the ultimate resources of this country would have been brought into operation, so soon after the adoption of the federal constitution ? Within about twelve years, we have nearly embraced the extensive system of British taxation—our impost and excise are proportionably burdensome with those of the English—stamp duties, house and land taxes, already bear heavy on the yeomanry ; but our loans at *eight per cent.* exceed the lavish douceurs of Britain, even under all the weight of war and perplexity of their finances. In order then to know the amount of expenses, it is proper that the treasury department should be fully investigated, and that the statement should be within the comprehension of every intelligent citizen ; when this is done, all the financiering mystery will be dissipated, which has for many years past clouded our fiscal communications—arithmetic, instead of "*instrumentality*," would be the table whereby we could make our calculation—debt and credit would be substantiated beyond the possibility of deception, and the *balance* would be so explicit, that we should not be puzzled to know whether it was in our favour or against us.

This system of expenditure is so important, that we cannot dwell too long on the subject. The people of the United States are generally industrious and enterprising ; the property earned by the farmer in his field, by the tradesman in his work-shop, and by the merchant in his counting-room, is too sacred to be sported with, for the emolument of others. The *sweat of the brow* are drops too precious to be applied in such profusion, as to run down (like the oil from Aaron's beard) on the skirts of a few favourites, but, like a valuable and costly ingredient, should be applied with a medical skill and accuracy. That this country is involved in a heavy debt, cannot be denied, and that the articles of taxation

have far exceeded every calculation which could rationally be made, is equally as evident. Though the investigation of the treasury department may bring to view such particulars as may be disgusting to some individuals, yet the body of citizens would be highly gratified by the disclosure.

The duties of impost, excise, &c. have been more generally paid within the United States than in any other country—it is true, a *few federalists* have been caught attempting to defraud the government. In England, smuggling is reduced to a science, and a great proportion of dutied articles are landed clear of the inspection of the custom-house; notwithstanding which, they are able to pay an interest on a debt of four hundred and fifty-two millions sterling.

This being a fact, it must be granted, that an immense revenue has arisen from duties since the adoption of the Federal Constitution. The question then is, WHAT HAS BECOME OF THE MONEY? This is a very important inquiry, as it involves in it the secret transactions within the Treasury; it brings into view the expenditures of an Army and Navy, Indian War, with all the items of “mismanagement and neglect,” Algerine Negotiations, Treaty Appropriations, Agent Contracts, Bank and Foreign Loans, &c. in short, the *sanctum sanctorum* of fiscal arrangements would be laid open to the inspection of an interested public: and, like a doom’s-day book, would decide on the merits or demerits of those who have had the management of our government. In this inquiry, it is probable we should discover the *magic source of FEDERALISM*—how far the private interest of individuals has been connected with certain high-toned measures; the blessings of agencies, contracts, and official appointments, both at home and abroad. We might possibly discover the *cause* of the violent opposition to a change of men and measures—why Mr. Jefferson has been calumniated, and why Mr. Gallatin is dreaded. The Treasury department is so involved in the measures of government, that it is the key by which we may hope to unlock the *Pandora box*, which contains *tub-plots*, *Ocean massacres*, and even Harper’s famous “*clues to conspiracies*.” That is, we may know how far these alarms have been connected with certain financiering projects.

That every dollar has not been fairly expended, I would not presume to suggest, but information on this subject is necessary and

proper. It would serve to quiet the minds of those who are jealous, that we have not "worked things right;" but if the expenditures can be justly accounted for, it will stop the clamours of such as are censorious in their remarks.

The great opposition made in our *federal* papers against the appointment of Mr. Gallatin, as secretary of the treasury, has a tendency to excite a suspicion, that this investigation would expose particular transactions to severe animadversion. These same persons are firm friends to Mr. Hamilton, though he is as much a *foreigner* as Mr. Gallatin. They pretend to object to his appointment on this ground, but his abilities and peculiar talents for this business, even his enemies cannot controvert. The finances of this country have long been his study, and the accuracy of his statements cannot be denied by his opponents. His industry and integrity were never brought into question, and his family connections and large landed property are pledges of his faithful adherence to the happiness and prosperity of the United States. He has been calumniated by those who have committed the same violation on others, but, thank heaven, calumny in the federal papers is not the evidence of a man's demerit; it rather qualifies him for the confidence of every real friend to America. Though calumny has exhausted her venom against his political conduct, yet his honesty has stood invulnerable against all the shafts of his opponents. If talents are requisite, he possesses them to as great a degree as any man—if *morality* is the touchstone, will Mr. Gallatin be *injured* in his reputation by a comparison with others? I will venture to predict, that the first communication to Congress from Mr. Gallatin, on the state of the treasury, will be as universally applauded, as the speech of President Jefferson. Such light will be thrown on the dark recesses of the treasury, that each citizen will consider the statement among the most valuable papers of the government.

I have been more particular in my remarks, as our money concerns are peculiarly interesting. In case of peace, it will be difficult to support the system of revenue under all the embarrassments of commerce. The present state of the treasury is due to the administration of Mr. Jefferson; it is the ground-work of his future conduct, as the people ought to know the situation of our money concerns at the time of his entrance into office. If the last administration left a heavy debt upon us—if an immense revenue

has been raised, and it has all been expended, certainly Mr. Jefferson is not answerable for the consequences. He, no doubt, will pursue a system of economy, but the debt hitherto contracted, is a burden which he must be obliged to discharge. His enemies are aware of his embarrassments, and are telling the people that the change is of no consequence, as taxes will be equally as high under the present as the last administration. In order, therefore, to prevent an unreasonable censure, if a just statement is made of our fiscal concerns, the complaint of taxes must rest on those who originated the evil. His public conduct will stand on his individual merit, and what may be attached to it in consequence of previous embarrassments cannot be chargeable to him.

I again repeat, that the treasury department is of all others the most interesting and important. It is the ark of our political safety, and may the economical system of Mr. Jefferson convince the people, that the waters of extravagance have subsided.

## No. XXXV.

### INTRODUCTORY TO SOME FUTURE COGENT REFLECTIONS.

IN politics as in religion the human mind is more influenced by passion than reason. To effect this purpose, in all controversial points relating to church or state, certain *technical terms* are used by partizans to gain an ascendancy. The *divine* confounds his antagonist with the preponderating charm of *orthodoxy*; if he acquires a popular applause under this fascinating appellation, he is sure to gain an ascendancy over every opponent; for who can stand in opposition to orthodoxy? But the misfortune is, that the world is not agreed in applying the term to any particular sect. In some countries, the infallibility of the Pope, the purity of Mother Church, transubstantiation, and the efficacy of priestly benedictions, are the test of *orthodoxy*. In the *reformed* countries, the Right Reverend Father in God partakes in some degree of the excellencies and virtues of the Papal Hierarchy, and the various

grades issuing from this evangelical fount are estimated in proportion as the benediction is accompanied with official emoluments.

*"A Saint in crape is twice a Saint in lawn."*

A firm belief in all the paraphernalia of this *reformed* establishment, is in some nations called *orthodoxy*; and no man can expect promotion or even common credence, if he is so jacobinical as not to subscribe to every article promulgated by St. Athanasius. Orthodoxy is a term which has had a wonderful effect in society—the Calvinist claims it as his prerogative—the Socinian assumes a right to the appellation—the Universalist modestly begs to be considered within the latitude of its influence; and every sect, however differing in the most essential points, plume themselves as carrying this standard.

Thus, in religion, we are led away by a term which in itself is perfectly right, provided we can ascertain the real principle which constitutes its authenticity. The definition of Orthodoxy, is *true belief*; but the sentiment is so sublimated, that we are lost in the application. One man's true belief is another's evident error; various speculative subjects lead to different conclusions, but passion often so "*demoralizes*" reason, that men may so far adhere to terms imbibed by education, as to anathematize others because they assume a right to exercise their judgment in deciding for themselves.

These remarks are not made to weaken the ground of orthodoxy as it respects religion; but to shew, that *terms*, without a defined object, are more apt to irritate partizans than to make converts. High church and low church, illuminati, jacobinism, anti-federalism, *modern philosophy*, *demoralizing principles*, &c. have been the common cant phraseology of very formidable opponents for many years, and it was only to give currency to the respective appellations as the parties acquired an ascendancy, in order to blast the reputation of the individuals who espoused opposite opinions. Reason was buried in the mass of detraction, and no man's character stood secure while there were more tongues to *bellow* it down, than to *reason* it up. In this case it is like a contest on a precipice, the most numerous could easily *croud over* their opponents.

At present I shall be very brief in making my application.--- The disposition, above described, has too long been the *palladium* erected against every thing that looked like an opposition to certain established terms in politics. At the period when our Constitution was under the deliberative investigation of the state convention, the terms *federal* and *anti-federal* were the principal weapons of warfare. The man who hesitated to adopt it without amendments was cried down as an anti-federalist ; federalism was the order of the day, and the test of patriotism was an explicit avowal of your belief in every minute point of the instrument submitted to the consideration of the people ; the person who dared to think, was pursued as an enemy to his country. But, notwithstanding this system of terror, the good sense of the opposers rose superior to personal persecution, and at length obtained amendments which are *now* considered as the most valuable parts of the constitution. Even after the establishment of the government, these nominal distinctions were kept up, but evidently with this difference as to the objects of the parties, *those who meant to administer it on the principles contemplated by the respective State Conventions* were styled *anti-federalists*, and those who attempted to destroy every republican feature in its construction were styled *federalists*.—As an evidence of this remark, let any man read the debates of Massachusetts, and he will find that those called anti-federal in Congress have acted more consistent with the sentiments of the state, than those who have assumed the title of federalists. Mr. Varnum has spoken the language of the New-England States, and all his decisions have been agreeable to the doctrines inculcated in their respective conventions, and yet he has been peculiarly singled out, as a disorganizer and an enemy to the constitution. The gentlemen from Virginia have been uniform in their adherence to the original principles of the Northern States. Mr. Jefferson, in all his measures, has strictly conformed to the spirit which pervaded Massachusetts, New-Hampshire, Rhode-Island and even Connecticut.--- Taking the debates in Convention as the test of federalism, I will appeal to every American, whether the opposition of the pretended federalists to particular characters, has not been in proportion to their attachment to the fundamental principles of the constitution, as contemplated at the period of its adoption? Why was General Dearborne calumniated when brought forward as a mem-

ber for Congress ? Was it that he had abandoned the ground on which the government was established ?—No—but the truth is that he adhered to all those radical points which gave energy to the debates in Convention, and which finally destroyed the force of opposition to its adoption. Why has Judge Lincoln been opposed ; is it because he had a disposition to destroy government and *demoralize* society ?—No—his integrity led him to maintain the pure principles of the Constitution, and when the enemies of our national happiness found him tenacious of the rights of the people, they attempted to injure his reputation by slander and defamation. I could go on to mention individuals, but the catalogue needs no enumeration.

*Fellow-Citizens*—It is time to recur to first principles, and in order to ascertain them, peruse the debates of the several Conventions, more especially Massachusetts. These are the touchstones by which *federalism* must be tried—they are the records of public opinion on the constitution, at the all important period of its adoption. Read them attentively, and then judge between the men who are styled federal and anti-federal. Mr. Jefferson is, strictly speaking, a *New-England federalist*, and so is every man who has been abused by a body of railers under the deceptive mask of friends to order and good government.

## No. XXXVI.

### RECAPITULATION.

#### FELLOW-CITIZENS,

SINCE the days that our forefathers disembarked on the rock at Plymouth, the designs of the enemies of this country were never more artfully pursued than within the period of a few years past—"deep laid plots, well woven snares," have intersected almost every footstep of the unsuspecting citizen. The *British treaty* was the drama which first introduced every monstrous deformity alarming to the *neutral rights* of America.

At this crisis, recollect, fellow-citizens, with what arrogance a "JUNTO" erected their menacing front. Those of us who ventured to speak, or even modestly to think, in opposition to them,



were threatened with the full vengeance of political denunciation. During this terrific consternation, there was almost a pause in society ; scarcely a voice was heard, unless to eulogize the authors of our misfortunes, and no ejaculation could be whispered, unless to implore heaven to sanction the projects of those who were threatening our ruin.

But how deceptive was the friendship which such men pretended to express ! How delusive their attachment to the permanency of the *federal Constitution* ! As soon as this treaty was completed in all its parts, they stepped forward and placed themselves in an undisguised position. From that moment, the conduct of the enemy became open, vindictive and decisive ; every measure was devised, and even “ bold strokes ” contemplated to involve us in a war. During this political tempest, a sedition law rose like a malignant meteor, and threatened to consume, in its progress, every vestige of republican freedom. An army was raised to act with vigour and promptitude, when other accidental circumstances should countenance their effective exertions. YOUNG MEN were occasionally called together, (intermixed with some of *mature age*) and processions formed, to hear, in the house of God, the discordant babblings of those who were appointed to officiate. The prosperity and peace of the country were suspended by a thread of the most delicate texture, and if heaven had not miraculously interposed, our ruin must have been inevitable. Even some whose *duty* leads them to *pray for peace*, were constantly throwing combustibles on the altar, peculiarly calculated to promote the horrid catastrophe of war, and many of the pulpits were converted into rostrums, to promulgate the dreadful doctrine of carnage and extermination.

In the midst of this public inflammation, a signal was given, under the appellation of a COCKADE, which nearly brought the citizens to the verge of a civil war. This badge was carried to an excess which threatened the most serious consequences. Those who refused to copy this servile distinction were exposed to every insult. They were treated with the grossest indignity, while the most obnoxious during our revolution, were held in reverence, provided they displayed this childish trapping of federalism.

An old tory, with a cockade, was more respected than an old whig without it.

This has been the degrading situation of our country, during a reign of terror ; the republicans have been *buffed* by a faction, which had acquired an ascendancy by the excess of their effrontery. The presses, for the most part, were under their control, and Corporal Porcupine was the chief director of this complicated system of fraud and wickedness ; he was the orb round which the federal satellites moved.

The republican, who dared to stand between this conflict, was placed in the ludicrous situation of a man's body as described in an almanack, governed by Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Leo, Scorpio, Pisces, &c. ; he was beset, from head to feet, with political daggers. The *signs of terror* were like the *twelve signs of the zodiack* ; —they moved under different directions, and each of them acquired an influence under Federalism, Anti-Jacobinism, Illuminism, Atheism, Deism, *Modern Philosophy*, *Demoralizing Principles*, &c.—Thus inflated, the public mind was susceptible to every wrong impression, and the well disposed citizens were exposed to those hurricanes of passion, which political and ecclesiastical fanaticism have conjured from the caverns of monarchy, aristocracy and priesthood.

At this period of terror, the federal papers (falsely so called) were holding up the abettors of these persecuting measures as *exclusive friends to the constitution*. But no sooner had they accomplished their purposes, than Porcupine, Fenno, &c. began their attacks upon this palladium of our liberties. The Constitutions were satirized under the degrading similitude of “a sow with a litter of pigs” ; an hereditary establishment of President and Senate was promulgated as the desideratum of government ; a division of the northern and southern States was proposed as the most desirable object ; and it is worthy of observation, that in proportion as the faction acquired an ascendancy, under the term *federalism*, they became more bold and assuming in degrading the *principles of our constitution*. Porcupine commenced his libellous remarks on this instrument, while Fenno and the Farmer's Museum reprobated “republicanism as a leprosy.” The division of the northern and southern States seems to be seriously contemplated by these pretended *federal* papers, and no one carries a stronger evi-

dence of such a design than the "*New-England Palladium*"; this paper appears calculated to effect this purpose, as most of the paragraphs are fraught with abuse against almost every State, south of Connecticut. The President, and all the "constituted authorities," are treated with that unbounded scurrility which none but disorganizers and enemies to our government can pretend to approve.

But, thanks to that BEING who has ever been watchful over the liberties of this country, the DAY OF TERROR is past, and the citizens assume their wonted dignity. We can now reason, and apply our arguments to the good sense of the people; we are restored to the high station of republicans; no degrading insignia designate one citizen from another; the *mind*, and not the *hat*, gives the evidence of patriotism. The man, who means to injure his country cannot shroud himself under false colours; his decided conduct, and not his tongue-professions, is the test of integrity.

President JEFFERSON has commenced his administration upon the genuine principles of our Constitution; he seeks no asylum within a sedition law, neither does he screen himself under the tyrannical construction of the Common Law of England; he stands on a level with his fellow-citizens, and to their tribunal he appeals for an impartial verdict. While defamation issues from the pretended federal papers, he must find a consolation in the integrity of his heart, and rectitude of his conduct. He seeks no protection from declamatory partizans, but stands, like Moses on the mount, with the law for his protection. While a few unprincipled men are abusing him, (who have long followed the federal government solely for the "loaves and fishes" of their office) yet, as he knows the baseness of their hearts, he views their calumny with the most consummate indifference; such men are unworthy the confidence of *any government*, for they would cry hosanna, or crucify, for the paltry recompence of "thirty pieces of silver." Like Judas, they would take a *sheep* from their master, and enter the next hour into a league with the *chief priests* to betray him. How inconsistent, then, are such people; and what can be said in their vindication?—The fact is, they are false and hollow in their attachment to our constitution, and after attempting to sacrifice Mr. Adams, they are now desirous to rally again under his patronage; but we hope he begins to discern their duplicity.

Mr. Jefferson has commenced his administration at a most important period ; the republican system is to be tried under his wisdom and *decision* ; the enemy know this, and are endeavouring to sow tares in the political field. The *republican citizens* gave him their support, and his good sense will lead him not to disappoint their expectations. The CONSTITUTION is the polar star, and while an “*Effex faction*” are attempting to divide and disunite, the real friends of our country will rally round him as their patron. Thus consolidated by our union, we trust in God, that the enemies of our liberties will not be able to prevail against us. The tree of American liberty has been fertilized by the blood of republicans, and may it never be blasted nor suffered to decay by the pestiferous exhalations of enemies, under the appellation of federalists ; or Illuminati hypocrites, under the garb of religion.

*Fellow-Citizens*—Judge ye then between Mr. JEFFERSON and his *opponents*.

## No. XXXVII.

### ON EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS.

THE ridiculous pedantic remarks of ignorant critics being unworthy notice, I shall not affront the public by making a reply to their absurdities. If such insignificant beings expect to gain a reputation by my *condescending to expose their folly*, they will be disappointed ; *they* are a species of insects too despicable to be *crushed* by the smallest weight which could be applied for their dissolution.

The present number is particularly reserved for the investigation of a subject, which has peculiarly drawn forth the whole artillery of the *Effex faction* against Mr. Jefferson. They have expended in a great measure their fire of deism, atheism, jacobinism, &c.—they find themselves defeated in these attacks ; but, as the last resort, have rallied their whole force to check him in his official appointments.

The constitution has wisely reserved, in particular instances, this right to the executive.—At the time the constitution was adopted, this prerogative was considered as a high preservative to

the government ; for if the President is amenable for his conduct, he ought surely to have officers in whose political integrity he can confide. If he adopted a particular system of administration, it was proper that all those with whom he was connected should be friendly to his purposes. This is an essential quality in an elective government, for as the people have a right to change their public servants, the process of their administration should be uniform in all its parts, in order to ascertain the merits or demerits of the plans adopted and prosecuted. If this position is not admitted, how can a President maintain a consistency of conduct in the various objects contemplated, while a certain part of the government are inimical to his proceedings?—such a discordancy of parts would be like a house divided against itself ; the government must ever be in disorder, while there are various wheels in the machinery counteracting the motions of each other.

This mode of conduct generally, if not universally, was adopted by Mr. Adams. He displaced almost every man opposed to his politics, and appointed others in whom he could confide for an adherence to all his measures. Mr. Adams had, by these means, a fair trial of his political system ; as every one, acting under him, assisted to his utmost ability to promote his wishes. If this was *right* in Mr. Adams, why should it be *wrong* in Mr. Jefferson ? Why should we not admit Mr. Jefferson to the same privileges exercised by Mr. Adams ? The last administration went to the utmost extent of presidential patronage ; nearly every officer stood ready to execute the will of this branch of the government.—Prosecutions were commenced, and every person who dared to lift any thing against the administration, immediately became the object of vindictive resentment. Every person must allow that Mr. Adams had the full sweep of executive influence ; and the friends of Mr. Jefferson only require a balance to restore the government to an equilibrium.

The above observations are rather general ; but I am willing to consider this subject on the particular premises admitted by the opposers of Mr. Jefferson. When this gentleman was chosen President, these people declared in every newspaper, *that the system of the administration was to be changed*. They openly avowed their enmity to him, and said that jacobin influence had introduced him to the government. If it is thus granted, that a particular interest

supported Mr. Jefferson's election ; and if it is further acknowledged, that the same interest was opposed to Mr. Adams ; the consequences which follow are, that the parties were at issue on the event of the election.

The propriety of the opposition, and the utility of the change, are to be evidenced by the future operation of the administration ; but can any reasonable man suppose that Mr. Jefferson could prosecute a system analogous to his sentiments, if he kept in office those men who were diametrically opposed to him ? How could he move within the sphere assigned him, when the greatest part of his official agents were counteracting his measures ? It was in my last Number observed, that we are now trying the full extent of a republican government, under Mr. Jefferson ; and if this is the case, is it not proper that he should have those in government who are friendly to the experiment, who wish to maintain the respectability of his character, and who are sincere friends, and not sycophantic hypocrites ?

Certainly Mr. Jefferson is entitled to the same indulgence with Mr. Adams, and while we allow him to exercise his constitutional rights, the people will be able to judge, during his four years' officiality, whether the change is for the better or for the worse. To judge candidly on this question, we must allow him the privilege to appoint such men as will act congenial with his principles. If he is wrong in his judgment, we shall soon see the fallacy of our confidence, and at the next election endeavour to introduce some other person to rectify his mistakes.

The republicans only wish to try Mr. Jefferson by the same touchstone the federalists proved Mr. Adams ; if he fails, we are willing to relinquish him, and bring forward some other person more adequate to the purpose. Republicans are not attached to men, but principles. At present, we place our confidence in Mr. Jefferson, and in order that this gentleman should have a *fair trial*, we think he is perfectly right in appointing such persons as will promote the general system of his administration. If, from a false delicacy, or from fear of the clamours of his enemies, he keeps a majority of his opponents in office, how can he expect to maintain the government upon that ground which he has uniformly advocated ? If he was in opposition to the extravagant conduct of the last administration, how can he adopt a plan of economy while he

retains a majority of officers who were acting under an opposite regimen ?

The fact is, as Mr. Jefferson is now President of the United States, he must have officers who are friendly to his operations ; otherwise the business of government will move under a pressure, which will baffle all his skill to remove. Those persons who are jealous of his administration, and yet expect him to retain all the former officers, are as unreasonable as the Egyptians, in forcing the Jews to make brick without straw. He must have republican materials, if he is to effect republican purposes ;—in an army, a general must have officers on whose friendship he can rely, to succeed in any expedition.

Who are the particular individuals *in office*, or who are *out*, are but small questions among the people. If honest, uniform republicans are appointed, and the government is administered on constitutional principles—if economy is practised in the expenditure of public money—if the liberties of the country are maintained—if our property is secure, our persons protected, and peace and harmony prevail, “ WE, THE PEOPLE ” are perfectly willing that Mr. Jefferson should exercise his constitutional right, in putting down one who might oppose these salutary purposes, and setting up another who might promote them.

We have no partiality for men, otherwise than as firm friends to their country ;—we do conceive, however, that those who are partially attached to Britain, and in all instances endeavour to open a breach between France and America, are the greatest enemies to the happiness and prosperity of this country ; such men ought to be avoided, and never suffered to partake of the official emoluments of government.

Why should a removal from office be considered an “ intolerant spirit ” ? Rotation is rather a republican principle—no man has such a claim on government as to demand a constant support from it. If the officers under the former administration have for many years experienced the emoluments of their appointments, why are they dissatisfied that some others should have equal advantages ? The pecuniary benefits of the government ought to be diffusive, and no family or particular individuals have reason to find fault, if some other citizens are provided for, equally as deserving as themselves. The “ intolerant spirit ” arises, not from the conduct

of Mr. Jefferson, but from his opponents. As supreme executive, the constitution gives him a right to confer offices of trust and profit, and while exercising this prerogative, is it not unreasonable that those who have heretofore enjoyed them, should murmur and calumniate him for distributing his favours ?

His constitutional right cannot be disputed, and certainly his appointments ought to be *appropriate* to the system which he contemplates. If he means to pursue a line of economy, he would be very unwise to keep those in office, whom he has reason to think have been lavish of the public money in their respective departments. If he means to prosecute measures on the pure principles of republicanism, he must be justified in placing such men in government, as have given the highest proofs of their attachment to it. If he has reason to think that many have not acted strictly conformable to those principles, common prudence will dictate the necessity of a change. The question is, can a republican system be carried on with alacrity, while many of the officers of government have a strong predilection for an aristocracy ? Can the government be kept in a state of quietude, while a great proportion of the officers are in heart opposed to THE MAN, under whom the executive part of the administration is conducted ?

These persons are often quoting those words of Mr. Jefferson's speech, "*We are all federalists, we are all republicans,*" and draw a conclusion in their own favour, that, *as such they ought to continue in office*. However, if we are *all* federalists and republicans, let us practise on the acknowledged principle of republicanism, viz. *rotation* ; but these men claim an exclusive right to the title and say, *none are federalists but WE and OUR PARTY* ; and *they* claim "*all the religion, all the morality,*" all the *patriotism*, and of course ought to hold *all the lucrative offices* in government ; nobody can be trusted but *they* and *their friends*, and all the citizens who advocated Mr. Jefferson, ought to be reprobated by *him*. If we are "*all federalists, all republicans,*" why should not Mr. Jefferson's friends be rewarded by some appointments, as well as Mr. Adams's adherents ? They seem to think that the government was made for *them*, and unless *they* have an exclusive right, they are *justified* in calumniating the constituted authorities, and even convulsing society. They are the political horse-leaches, crying, give, give.



## No. XXXVIII.

ON THE FALLACY OF CHARGING THE REPUBLICANS  
WITH INTOLERANCE.

THOSE of the *faction* who complain of an "intolerant spirit" on the part of President Jefferson, if they are serious in their lamentations, must be very deficient in the intellect of *memory*. If we deliberately reflect on *their conduct*, during the last administration, it must bring to remembrance a long train of circumstances, which are distressing at this period even to contemplate. Never could it have been thought possible, that any party should obtain such an ascendancy in this country, as to *intimidate* the free citizens of America from speaking their minds on public measures, or acquire such a preponderancy as to impress them with *fear* while exercising their constitutional suffrages ; but this cruel deprivation of rights have been experienced under a system of terror, which nearly pervaded not only every district, but almost every family throughout the United States ; the operation in many instances has been so effectual, that elections have been decided under the dreaded apprehensions of this vindictive influence. Threats and menaces have been the irresistible arguments, and votes have often been obtained by the arbitrary interference of men, whose hardened hearts exulted at the prospect of inflicting penury on those who dared to counteract their designs. This mode of conduct was striking at the foundation of a republican government, as the basis of its construction is immediately connected with the free and unbiassed principles of each individual in society. *Private opinion* in the aggregate must form the public sentiment, for while every citizen has a right to judge on the conduct of public officers, and to vote in most cases in their election, the ultimate decision depends on the majority of electors acting in their individual capacity. This freedom of investigation and action are the privileges guaranteed by the constitution, and no man ought to be intimidated from the full exercise of these rights, or denounced as an enemy to his country, while discharging in a legal manner (with the spirit of *candour and moderation*) this important duty.

The republicans are willing to take this broad ground as it relates to Mr. Jefferson ; they do not wish to check the most subtle animadversions on his measures ; his enemies have an uncontrolled right to offer their remarks on all his proceedings. If they please, they may censure his plans, or propose others ; but, if this freedom is allowed them, and, if in fact they improve it to the utmost latitude, let them only be so *candid*, as not to charge the republicans with exercising an unrelenting spirit of persecution towards them.

It is truly laughable to see in the *jacobin* papers, such as the *Centinel*, *Palladium*, *Commercial Gazette*, *Port Folio*, &c. the most intolerable abuse on the President, and all the constituted authorities ; and yet, while they are permitted to continue their billingsgate without any check by prosecutions, or personal insult, are crying in the most lamentable strains against the intolerant and persecuting spirit of republicans. I would ask these slanderers, in what instance this vindictive spirit has prevailed ? Are any of their friends imprisoned for their libels ? Or are any under the lash of the sedition law ? Why do they complain of persecution, when they are suffered to vent the utmost malignancy of their spleen, arrogance, and resentment ? Do they not pursue their courses of defamation as rapidly as the presses can disgorge them, or the several posts can circulate them ? Every day in the week they are handed to the public---almost every house is supplied with them---colleges, academies, and schools are liberally furnished with “ line upon line, and precept upon precept,” here a *little* and there a *good deal*. What then, in the name of common sense would these *infuriated jacobins* want ? Nobody molests them, they speak as they please, write as they please, and publish what they please, and yet they are so unreasonable as to complain of a rigid spirit of persecution.

If these *high-toned jacobins* will say what will be satisfactory to them, if it is not too unreasonable, possibly they may be indulged in their request. But the fact is, they want Mr. Jefferson to issue a proclamation, declaring that HIS ENEMIES possess *all the religion, all the morality, all the virtue, all the property, all the patriotism, all the wisdom and all the honesty in the country*---and that HIS FRIENDS are a body of miscreants, destitute of religion, morality, honesty, &c. and *as such*, were unworthy of *his confidence*. Nay, they wish him

to go further, and denounce every man who *voted for him* or *spoke in his favour*, as a disorganizer, deist, and robber. I would ask these *modest gentlemen*, whether this declaration would satisfy them? Whether this humble acknowledgment on the part of Mr. Jefferson would remove their complaints against him? Would they cease abusing him, if he should give it under his *hand and seal*, that every office in government should be filled by his most inveterate opponents? That they should have the exclusive patronage of government, and still have it in their power to treat with the grossest indignity every man who was friendly to his election?

As the controversy now stands, I do not see that any thing short of such a manifesto will suit them. For they are permitted to speak in the public papers a language somewhat similar to this—they constantly vilify the President, and call his adherents plunderers and villains—they are suffered without molestation to use epithets the most degrading; notwithstanding which, they keep up a constant cry about the *intolerant spirit* of the republicans. Permit me, *modest gentlemen*, again to ask, who among you is persecuted? In general you strut about the streets with your usual hauteur, though in some particulars a little more cautious in your *personal insult*; none of you are under bonds to appear at the District Courts to answer for libels. Your funds have risen rapidly since the election of Mr. Jefferson, and every thing appears perfectly secure within the alcoves of the federal insurance offices. The *respectable corps of negociators* are as busy in their speculations as usual, and each of them sits within his little *snug department* in State-Street, like Patience on a monument, having none to make him afraid. Where then, *modest gentlemen*, is the danger? Wherein are you injured? Be calm, be composed, there is no danger but what arises within your own distempered pericranium.

For the sake of argument, let these persons be placed in the situation which was experienced by the republicans, about three years back. If the same spirit had now prevailed *against them*, as was exercised *by them*, during those periods, they would be justified in reprobating the spirit of persecution. Suppose the republicans had adopted a black insignia under the appellation of a *Cockade*; threatened to send every one who refused to wear it within the lines of the enemy; pointed the “finger of scorn” at those who had resolution enough to withstand their threats and insolence;

and had employed a number of bullying editors to traduce the characters of such as would not submit to the imposition : Suppose further, that the republicans had employed a number of hiring priests to anathematize in the *pulpit*, while they were defaming in the *papers*—to propagate falsehoods on Fast and Thanksgiving days, under the deceptive mask of sermons and pious discourses : Admit further, that the judges were fulminating their common law against the Centinel, Palladium, &c. as they formerly did against the Chronicle, Aurora, &c.—that the editors were imprisoned and fined for their attempts to bring the “ President into contempt” : Suppose that a member of the legislature should have the impudence to anticipate a decision of that body, by declaring his opponents “ *a contemptible minority*” : Admit further, that the republicans forced themselves into all social circles, and erected the standard of persecution even amidst institutions, established on the broad basis of benevolence and “ *relief in distress*”—that the wicked spirit of intolerance should poison the streams of friendship and mutual safety—that sycophants should become so base and destitute of principle, as to disturb in such meetings that order and fraternity which ever characterized the citizens of Boston. The ignominy of such conduct must be forever reprobated, while honour and urbanity are esteemed essential requisites to designate the reputation of gentlemen.

A review of past times is requisite, in order to exhibit a portrait which must sicken those who gave the finishing strokes to the picture. Federalism was distorted, and displayed the features of a monster ; instead of the pleasing deportment of good fellowship and brotherly affection, it more nearly assumed the hostile attitude of an assassin, and its terrific menaces were the powerful weapon which proselyted its votaries. The most abandoned of our citizens basked in some instances under the patronage of its title, and screened themselves while practising their villany under the specious garb of federalism. The honest man often suffered by the appellation of *jacobinism*, and the rogue as often matured his projects by the imposing term of *federalism*.—Thank God, the public mind is now at rest, and principle, and not terror is the order of the day.

## No. XXXIX.

## TO "OLD-BRICK."

THE high estimation in which I hold the religious society under the appellation of the "*Old-Brick*," led me to peruse your address in the *Commercial Gazette* with peculiar attention. The venerable and respectable characters which have officiated in that ecclesiastical department, naturally excited an idea, that whoever assumed this signature would claim a particular respect, not only from the force of his arguments, but the decency with which they were communicated. The names of a Chauncy and a Clark will be ever esteemed, while energy of reasoning and purity of composition are considered as prominent characteristics to designate the scholar and gentleman.

But, sir, how great was my disappointment in finding you so deficient in every point which could impress that veneration which I anticipated in your address. Instead of that perfection of erudition and propriety of expression, which ever gave the "First Church" the *first reputation* in the literary world, the most sordid vulgarity and the most superficial reasoning disgrace the publication. As a friend to that religious society, I feel mortified in observing such billingsgate language attached to so respectable a signature. Since the corner-stone of that ancient building was laid, it is the first time that the *Old-Brick* was disgraced with calumny instead of argument, or scurrility instead of decency.

As a proof of my observations, I will quote a few of your remarks, and, if you are not destitute of sensibility, the flagrancy of your insult on the President will be sufficient to excite in your mind an abhorrence of your late publication. You say—"I wish to cover the defects of the *present*, under the merits of the *last, administration* ; but this (you add) is impossible ; for we might as well endeavour to assimilate Washington with Robespierre, as Adams with Jefferson." Now, Sir, pause a moment on the inference naturally drawn by this ungenerous remark on Mr. Jefferson—You place him in a character analogous to Robespierre ; the burden of proof therefore lies on you, to produce any similitude between the two characters. The cruelty and inhumanity of one has become

proverbial ; but in what instance has Mr. Jefferson shewn a disposition in any respect so sanguinary and vindictive ? Has he displayed a temper in any degree similar to Robespierre ? Has he erected a guillotine, or pursued his enemies with that unrelenting spirit which marked the footsteps of this tyrant ? Even if we quit the detestable character of Robespierre, and compare Mr. Jefferson with Mr. Adams, the magnanimity of his conduct is not depreciated. Has he, amidst the torrent of abuse heaped upon him in the papers, ordered any prosecutions against the authors, or are any of the editors presented in the federal courts to answer for their defamation ? Even you, Sir, feel a security in the lenity of his administration ;—for, let me ask you, whether you would have dared to write in the same strain against Mr. Adams, as you have done against Mr. Jefferson ? Would you have had the impudence and assurance to assert, as you now do, “ that Mr. Jefferson, after a few years trial, like some *impure metal*, will melt away, and nothing but the dross remain ” ?

Is this, Sir, a language which you ought to use towards the Supreme Executive of the United States ? Have you a right to arraign his administration, and denounce him at this early period of his political existence ? Will the removal of a few officers justify such a severe condemnation of his future conduct ? Have you the effrontery to place the happiness and prosperity of this country on the patronage bestowed on a select body of men, who have hitherto been employed in the lucrative functions of the government ? Or will you presume to declare, that Mr. Jefferson will “ melt away and become as dross ” ! because he has exercised his prerogative in giving the principle of rotation its proper operation ? Pray, Sir, examine the characters who now hold offices, and let me ask you, whether they are not men equally entitled to presidential patronage, as those who have heretofore enjoyed it ? From poverty, have not many of them risen to affluence ? Why then, Sir, let me ask you, should other citizens be excluded from equal benefits ?

If, Sir, you had written such a pointed libel on Mr. Adams, as you have against Mr. Jefferson, you would have been arraigned before the judiciary tribunal, and nothing short of your EARS would have atoned for the criminality of your allegations. In short, permit me to tell you, *Old-Brick*, the publications of such infuriated

*jacobsins* as yourself are full proofs of the mildness of Mr. Jefferson's administration ; and, with confidence I will further say, that you are so completely destitute of common civility, and at the same time so fraught with ignorance, that you take an advantage of his lenity in propagating your disorganizing principles. Your party are not capable of distinguishing between the mildness of the present, and the severity of the last, administration. If Mr. Jefferson should pursue them in the same manner as was formerly practised, their personal cowardice would be a sufficient "*gag-act*" to check their insolence. Their cause is so infamous, that they would not have resolution enough openly to avow their sentiments before a judiciary tribunal, though they may under the present *system of moderation* have temerity sufficient to declare the wickedness of their intentions. It is a happy circumstance, that the sedition law is repealed, as we can now judge how far their evil designs extend, and to what lengths they contemplated their measures, to overturn the republican principles of our country.

However, Sir, I will if possible endeavour to bring your remarks into some argumentative order, (though they are so deranged it is difficult to place them in any accurate form.) You say, that "*reasonable men* did suppose from Mr. Jefferson's speech, that he would pursue a system friendly to the good of the community, but we find the reverse has been the case, and from *all* present appearances, is likely to be so." Now, Sir, I would ask you, wherein he has pursued a system unfriendly to the community ? It is true he has displaced some men, and put others in their room. If this is the case, it does not follow, that the former were the most worthy, and the latter the most unworthy. If you assert, that "*his system is unfriendly to the community,*" it lies with you to *prove it*. Bring forward your characters, and let us try them by the touchstone of rectitude and ability. Is displacing the naval agent in Boston unfriendly to the community ? Is restoring Messrs. Whipple and Gardner attended with disagreeable consequences ? Is superseding the district attorney a matter of public lamentation, as it respects integrity or talents ? Is the appointment of Messrs. Madison, Lincoln, Dearborne, and Gallatin, at the head of their respective departments, unfriendly to the community ? Is forwarding the treaty to France, in the most *expedient* and *dignified* manner, injurious to the commercial interest of the United

States ? Is the system of economy, proposed by him, destructive to the general happiness ? Or will the saving of twenty thousand dollars annually, by abolishing the office of inspectors, “ speedily sink us into the gulph of anarchy ” ? If he has done any thing worthy of censure, point it out in *specific terms*, and do not, as a ‘ friend to order,’ stigmatize his conduct by general charges, without one evidence to support them.

I am aware that you will answer, that Mr. Gallatin’s appointment was injurious to the community. But, Sir, don’t be too hasty in this particular ; you are not yet competent to judge on this question. Time will discover the propriety of Mr. Jefferson’s conduct, in this instance ; wait at least till the meeting of Congress, and I believe that his communications on the subject of revenue, will convince “ The People ” of the wisdom of the executive, in selecting that gentleman for this department. The appointment of Mr. Bishop, you may say, is injurious to the community ; but I am well informed, that the office of Collector in the port of New-Haven, has never been more regularly and honestly conducted than since his officiality.

Now, sir, as you have presumed to come forward and charge Mr. Jefferson “ as pursuing a system injurious to the community,” I challenge you to produce your *specific charges*. It is needless to alarm the public with vague declarations. If you have any thing to allege, place yourself in the position of an *honest man*, and give the citizens the charges of crimination *in details*. In this case, I am willing to meet you ; but while you deal in scurrility and defamation, notwithstanding you take the respectable signature of “ *Old-Brick*,” yet, Sir, as I respect *truth* rather than *names*, your lucubrations (while they bear their present asperity) will be ever estimated by me as the malignant effusions of a disappointed, mortified, disorganizing partizan. Your suggestions are unfounded, your charges are *false*, and nothing but the mildness of THE MAN whom you calumniate, gives you confidence to pursue your scurrility and invective. If you have any modesty erase your signature, and no longer disgrace the *Old-Brick* with your uncandid and indecent publications.



## No. XL.

## ON THE CARRYING TRADE.

“’Tis from experience that we reason best.”

AS the great commercial privilege of the CARRYING TRADE is ridiculed, and almost reprobated by our *modern federalists*, it is proper while contemplating this subject, that we produce such evidence as will substantiate the sentiments of the *republicans*, in opposition to a doctrine so destructive to the interest of the United States. It is a happy circumstance, while considering this important question, that we can appeal to those who formerly came forward in support of our commercial rights ; and though a few may have apostatized from their avowed principles, yet it is hoped that a majority of the citizens retain their old opinions, unbiassed either by the smiles or frowns of their opponents. *Freemen* examine the *propriety of things*, and scorn to be influenced by the low, contemptible passion of *private interest*.

Being in possession of documents which cannot be controverted, I shall pursue a course of inquiry, founded on the sentiments of those individuals who took a lead in our commercial controversy with England, in the year 1785. If I am opposed by the modern federalists, it is incumbent on the gentlemen who wrote the following *Circular Letter*, to vindicate my observations, if they are desirous to substantiate a reputation for political consistency and integrity. Their letter conveys a strong idea of the importance of the CARRYING TRADE ; it portrays the pernicious tendency of British residents, and expresses, in the most forcible language, an abhorrence of those restrictions which exposed the commerce of America to the uncontrolled impositions of the British nation. While examining this subject, I shall pay due respect to the character of each individual ; but, at the same time, as *principle* is my object, I shall close with such observations as will oblige some of them to acknowledge, either that they were *wrong* in 1785, or that I am *right* in 1801.

W

This subject is important as it relates to the *young American merchant, tradesman, and manufacturer*, and as their interest is so immediately concerned in the question, I must request their particular attention to the numbers which may be appropriated to its consideration.

As introductory to my remarks, I shall insert the following Letter, written to the several states in the year 1785, on the arrival of a few British merchants in the town of Boston. The alarm excited at that period among the American merchants, will convince the *young men* that the MONOPOLY of our trade was considered as the inevitable consequence of permitting British residents to enjoy equal advantages with our own citizens. The agitation which prevailed at that time on the restrictions of our commerce, will fully shew how far the CARRYING TRADE was contemplated as the *palladium* of our commerce, agriculture and manufactures.

---

[CIRCULAR.]

“BOSTON, APRIL 22d, 1785.

“GENTLEMEN,

“WE being appointed by the merchants, traders and others, citizens of this town, to write to the merchants of the several seaports throughout the United States, on the alarming situation of our commercial intercourse with Great-Britain, do, in their names address you on the subject; which, we doubt not, you will think with us, requires mature deliberation, as well as the *most spirited* and vigorous exertions to be properly arranged.

“Happy should we be, if we could devise some plan which would effectually produce, and lastingly cement, that union of sentiment, on which so effectually depend the advantage and stability of the commerce of this country: we do not, however, presume to dictate what is best to be done in this critical situation of our affairs; but conceive it highly necessary to have a free communication of the sentiments of the mercantile interest; as on measures which may be adopted in consequence of this correspondence, some permanent and beneficial purposes may be effected.

“The CARRYING TRADE, so important to this country, is also essentially affected; and Great-Britain is endeavouring, by every means in her power, to annihilate it—by prohibiting the entry of our ships in her West-India colonies—discouraging, and

(by rumours which are generally exaggerated) preventing her own manufactures, intended for our consumption, from being shipped in American bottoms, unless burthened with an extra charge—by employing her vessels—by depriving our ships of the privilege of carrying the produce of our own country to Quebec, Newfoundland, &c.—and, by restricting the sale of them in any part of the British domains, confiscating the property in some instances, and subjecting it to duties equal to a prohibition in others; while the subjects of that nation are permitted to send their vessels to any part of the continent for bread, flour, tobacco, rice, &c.—and to ship them from most of the states, upon the same terms with our own citizens, and from others, with but a trifling discrimination. A trade, the balance of which is so essentially against us, must, if not speedily checked, INEVITABLY RUIN US.

“ Feelingly impressed, therefore, with the *necessity* of an immediate attention to a subject, so important to the people of America, *the merchants, traders, and others*, citizens of this town, have held a GENERAL MEETING, to consult upon measures necessary to be adopted on this occasion; the inclosed resolutions will acquaint you with the result of their deliberations; some of the expedients there used are meant only as temporary remedies, and intended solely to retard the *RUIN which threatens us*, until a general system of relief can be adopted.

“ Persuaded, however, that the exertions of individual cities, or even states, without the support of the whole confederacy, will be inefficacious, or at most can operate only as a partial relief, and that nothing short of vesting Congress with full powers to regulate the internal, as well as external commerce of all the States, can reach the mischiefs we complain of, we would, agreeably to the directions of the inclosed proceedings, earnestly recommend to you an immediate application to the Legislature of your State to vest such powers in Congress (if they have not already done it) as shall be competent to the great and interesting purpose of *placing the commerce of the United States upon the footing of perfect equality with every other nation*; and to request you also to petition Congress (when they shall be thus clothed with authority) to make such internal regulations as shall have that happy effect, encourage an attention to our manufactures, and remove the embarrassments under which our trade at present labours.

"Were not the embarrassments on our trade, by fatal experience, too well known to you to require a particular statement, it would be easy to prove the necessity of adopting this, or a similar conduct, by a detail of facts, and a train of arguments not fairly to be controverted, it being evident on the most cursory view, that the necessary effect of the Restrictions in question is, **DESTRUCTION TO OUR SHIP BUILDING, FISHERIES, NAVIGATION, AND COMMERCE IN ALL ITS BRANCHES**, and consequently to the **PROPERTY AND SUPPORT** of the merchant, husbandman, and mechanic.

"Your cheerful concurrence we may therefore in return expect; not doubting the success of such measures as are founded on the principles of justice and sound policy, and supported by the united and spirited exertions of a free people.

"To add to these evils already sufficient to excite our utmost disquietude, the late intervention of **BRITISH FACTORS**, threatens a monopoly of our trade, and hastens the rapid decrease of our circulating medium. Unless the trade and exports of these states are contravened by similar expedients on our part, the *commerce* of this country, and of consequence its wealth, power, and perhaps the *Union* itself, must become victims to the *artifice* of a nation, whose *arms* have been in vain exerted to accomplish the ruin of America.

"We are, Gentlemen, with every sentiment of respect and esteem, your friends and brethren in a common cause.

*John Hancock.*

*Samuel A. Otis.*

*Samuel Breck.*

*John C. Jones.*

*Samuel Barrett.*

*Edward Payne.*

*Caleb Davis.*

*Thomas Russell.*

*Jonathan L. Austin.*

*Charles Jarvis.*

*William Tudor.*

*Stephen Higginson.*

*Joseph Barrell.*

*Perez Morton.*

*Joseph Russell, jun."*

---

The foregoing letter is a **TEXT**, which will furnish a number of **DISCOURSES** through the *fall and winter months*. As I write only at my leisure, I shall pursue my observations with as much deliberation as some clergymen perform their sacerdotal functions. *Old sermons* are sometimes delivered, and probably *old remarks* may

occasionally furnish a speculative number. Having produced the *document* from whence my conclusions will be drawn, (accompanied with the foregoing respectable signatures) I shall feel perfectly at ease while descanting on the *patriotic principles* contained in the above Letter, and the *consistency* of the respective individuals who subscribed to its authenticity.

---

## No. XLI.

## ON THE CARRYING TRADE.

*To these Gentlemen of the Committee of Merchants, who signed the Circular Letter in 1785, for the purpose of restricting the British Trade, and who were in favour of the British Treaty in 1795.*

GENTLEMEN,

WHILE reading your important Letter, (which was communicated to the citizens in every commercial town throughout the United States) on the alarming situation of the American trade, and observing the name of Hancock among the subscribers, I cannot but drop a tear of condolence for our country that this patriot is no more. His spirit has ascended to the heavenly regions, and we trust receives those rewards peculiarly assigned to the philanthropist and patriot. He was always foremost in the cause of his country; he ever stood conspicuous as a friend to the rights of man; in every instance *he* placed himself in a *responsible* situation, when the welfare of America demanded it:—but alas, THE PEOPLE lost a friend, when the death of Hancock was announced. In *him* every *patriotic* heart was united, and he continued to his last breath, *uniform* in an adherence to his principles. In honour to *his memory* be it spoken, *he* never advocated a political measure, which his *real friends*, during the revolution, reprobated; neither was he *reduced* in any part of his administration, to look to the *old enemies* of his country for approbation. The patriot Hancock lived revered by his friends, and during the period of his existence, only the *invenomed pen* of a Laco dared to impeach his integrity.—The fidelity of Hancock was rewarded by the universal detestation of his defamer.

Your Circular Letter, gentlemen, in 1785, is honoured with the name of our deceased friend ; and no doubt, was he now alive, he would be active in vindicating the sentiments to which he then gave his signature. His *heart* and his *hand* ever beat and moved in unison : He was in no instance the *dupe* of a party, and never foolishly trusted to the support of men, who were planning measures to supersede him in his official capacity. He had such *sagacity* as would have defeated the designs of his enemies, if under the garb of flattery, they had meant to bring forward a rival to mar his political reputation.

Thy political reputation, Hancock, will ever be revered by the republican citizens of America ! Thou wilt live, *illustrious spirit*, in the *hearts* of thy countrymen ; and while liberty and the rights of thy country are duly estimated, *thy name* will be held in grateful remembrance ! The *proscription* of George the Third is a “ MAUSOLEUM ” to thy memory, which will survive a ponderous monument of marble !

Your *Circular Letter* of 1785, contains five principles—1st, that the CARRYING TRADE is important to the United States—2d, that the *impositions of Britain* are intolerable and grievous—3d, that the balance of trade with Britain is greatly against us—4th, an earnest recommendation to Congress, to place the commerce of America upon a footing of *equality with every other nation*—5th, that BRITISH FACTORS are ruinous to the commerce of our own citizens.

Upon these several particulars I shall occasionally address you. As some of you were strong advocates for the *British treaty*, and as this instrument, is now brought forward in our *tory papers* as the test of *federalism*, I now call upon you candidly to answer the following questions. As *truth*, and a fair statement of the subject before the public, are my sole objects, if you are *right*, and I am *wrong*, I will readily make an acknowledgment of my error.

If the *carrying trade* is important in your mind, does not the British treaty essentially injure it ? Does it not, by *extending the contraband articles*, annihilate a large portion of this branch of commerce ? Does it not, by depriving us of our *freighting business in the East-Indies* (which we enjoyed before the treaty without any obstruction) greatly lessen this profitable part of our trade ? Does not subjecting our vessels to be searched by the British, and being liable to be sent into their ports upon *bare suspicion*, embarrasses us in

almost all our foreign mercantile connexions ? Does not *admitting provisions* to become a contraband article essentially destroy that valuable part of our exports, and expose the produce of America to the rapacity of British cruisers ?

In short, Gentlemen, if you are *now* in favour of the British treaty, you cannot hold the same sentiments you did in 1785. To be consistent with your Circular Letter, you cannot *now* say, that the carrying trade is of the utmost importance to this country ; if you are in favour of the treaty, you must be obliged to change your language, and say, that the carrying trade, instead of being of the “ utmost importance,” is but of little consequence to our commerce. If British impositions were *then* thought grievous, surely the wanton captures and arbitrary decisions on our vessels since the treaty, must convince you, that Britain has not relaxed in her severities, since the adoption of it.—What boon have you obtained, gentlemen, by the treaty ? Some of you came forward in the *Old-South*, as the champions of our national honour ; the astonished multitude *clapped* with the utmost vehemence your enthusiastic speeches ; the *satellites*, within your influence, fancied they had got their depredation money in their pockets the moment the *Moderator* declared the vote in favour of the treaty appropriations. The individuals who had the resolution to oppose the measure, were derided by those whose folly led them to fancy that Pitt had all the money counted out in the exchequer, as soon as Mr. Gore should appear in England to receive it. They fancied that our orators would *terrify* the whole British government, and their *pretty speeches* would either soothe or intimidate the nation to cancel our claims.

To return, gentlemen, if you approve of the British treaty, you must disapprove of your former conduct ; for the instrument agreed to by Mr. Jay destroys every principle on which you predicated your Circular Letter in 1785. At that time, you were alarmed at the arrival of a few *British factors and agents* ; you represented them as “ destructive and ruinous to the American commerce,” as having a “ tendency to *monopolize* our whole trade.” But the treaty admits such persons to greater privileges than at the period you were opposed to them—and yet, surprising as it may seem, you became boisterous against them at that time, and *now* with the most submissive complacency accede to their admission.

This reverse of conduct requires some explanation. I would ask you, gentlemen, why the Carrying Trade was not in the year 1795, (when the treaty was adopted) equally important as in 1785, when you wrote your Circular Letter? Did not some of you flatter the tradesmen, that upon the ratification of the treaty the Carrying Trade would be *extended*? But since the treaty has been ratified, has not this important branch of commerce become subject to innumerable restrictions? If the decisions in British Courts of Admiralty are the supreme law of the land, will not the navigation of the United States in a few years fall a sacrifice to British policy? Will not our harbours and wharves, instead of being filled with American ships freighted on our own accounts, be thronged with British manufactures, consigned to English agents and Scotch factors, residing in our seaports for this purpose?

The next article, gentlemen, in your Letter is, that the *British trade is against us*. If this was the case in 1785, why not in 1801? If it was against us at that period, is it not more against us since we have submitted to the treaty? As by it, we allow greater privileges to the British than we did before—we rather *encourage* British subjects to carry on this pernicious trade—we give them a right to purchase stores, wharves, warehouses, &c. without limitation of time, and to pursue their business to the injury of every young American.

Some of you, gentlemen, may possibly think, that you are *now* beyond the destructive influence of these British residents and itinerants, by placing your property in the BANKS OR FUNDS. But reflect, first, how many YOUNG MEN, now comfortably situated in business, and whose *wives and children* depend on their industry, must feel the effects of a treaty, which gives residence to a body of *aliens*, to prosecute business in every part of the United States to the injury of our own citizens. In a few years this will be experienced, and the *young men* will have reason to rue the day that they attended to the artful designs of men, who have placed the principal part of their property in the BANKS AND FUNDS, or turned their business into other channels. On these things let our YOUNG MEN think, and reflect.



## No. XLII.

## NON-INTERCOURSE WITH FRANCE.

THE *Circular-Letter* from the merchants in the town of Boston, subscribed by some of those who now emphatically style themselves *federalists*, conveys in the strongest terms their disapprobation of the British government, in violating the commercial privileges of the United States. The sentiments inculcated at that period by those high-toned federalists, are now denounced as jacobinism. I would not hurt the feelings of the gentlemen by mentioning them *individually*, as any man by reading over the names of the Committee, can easily designate the friends to the treaty.

If the merchants, tradesmen, and others, in the town of Boston, were justifiable in their proceedings, at the time they forwarded their *Circular-Letter*, we must certainly conclude, that the advocates for the British treaty were blameable in every particular ---for this instrument baffled every principle contemplated by that measure. We gave up, by its adoption, every right, as it respected our neutrality, and submitted to the most humiliating degradation. Our Carrying Trade we laid prostrate at the feet of Britain, and as to *British factors*, we have, in the most humble attitude, courted them to our embraces. We have placed our own citizens at the footstool of aliens, and suffered our YOUNG MEN to become dependant on their clemency.

To estimate our European connexions, let us attend to the following statement, as submitted to Congress, in 1794 :

Our trade with Spain was	1,670,797	in our favour.
Portugal	1,687,696	do.
Netherlands	791,182	do.
Sweden	932,635	do.
France	2,630,387	do.
Denmark	126,000	against us.
G. Britain	5,923,912	against us.

These documents are authentic, and yet such has been our infatuation, that every measure has been taken to assist the nation

whose trade was *against us*, and injure those whose trade was *in our favour*.

When we talked of a non-intercourse with England, the partizans of Britain exclaimed that it would lead to a war; but when a proposition was made to annihilate our trade with *France*, these same men acceded to the measure with the most fervent complacency---that is, they were anxious to continue in connexion with a nation, the balance of whose trade was upwards of *five millions against us*, and break off every intercourse with those, whose balance was upwards of *two millions in our favour*. They were willing further to hazard in the controversy, Spain, the Netherlands, Sweden, &c. (whose balance also were in our favour) in order to form an alliance offensive and defensive with Britain. What a degree of infatuation must have possessed the minds of those projectors!!

The non-intercourse with France was such a favourite object, (notwithstanding our trade with her was so advantageous) that the YOUNG MEN were called upon to celebrate the period of its adoption---prayers were offered to heaven for its continuance---the priest paraded our streets arrayed in his canonicals---the meeting-house was thronged---the *young men* were summoned to attend the solemn mockery of the SUPREME BEING---a poetic orator was selected to celebrate the blessings of a controversy with a nation, whose balance of trade was nearly three millions in our favour.---Mysterious! unexampled!! incomprehensible!!!

This was the day of political madness. A few deceived *old men* countenanced a train of *misguided youths*, to celebrate the most impolitic measure that ever took place in our country.

Young men are not always to blame for imprudences, as experience will naturally mature their judgment. Time will ripen their decisions. Those whom they have heretofore considered as their enemies, will ere long be known as their friends; those whom they have reprobated as inimical to their interest, will soon be considered by them as the most attached to its promotion.

Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, Gen. Dearborne, Judge Lincoln, &c. are the uniform supporters of the real liberties of this country, as they relate to *commerce, agriculture, and manufactures*.---The abuse thrown on them, is the last desperate effort of a junto, which now sicken at the prospect of our *real* national independence.

While such people considered America as tending to a war with France, and an alliance with Britain, the highest encomiums were passed upon our government ; but now they find their projects are frustrated, they are endeavouring to destroy our confidence in the administration ; but, we trust in God, their mischievous designs will be baffled, and the United States rise superior to their machinations.

---

## No. XLIII.

## TO THE YOUNG MEN.

THE good sense which so peculiarly characterizes the *young republican citizens of the United States* is a happy omen that reason, instead of deception, will eventually terminate their decisions. The author of these Numbers would not wish to impose on their credulity, but is desirous rather to appeal to their judgment. The young men are materially interested in the great political questions which arrest the attention of the respective individuals within the United States. Their future prosperity depends on the rectitude of their determinations, for while the aged patriots are daily consigned to the tombs of their predecessors, the *rising generation* are to experience the blessings or misfortunes attendant on their public conduct. The *young American* is deeply involved in the consequences resulting from *right* or *wrong* measures. The direction will either advance his happiness or involve him in difficulties. Being thus interested in our political decisions, it is a duty incumbent on them to *read* and *judge* for themselves.

The revolutionary events in Europe are more connected with their future welfare than is generally imagined. It is a revolution, on the issue of which are suspended the political and commercial rights of society. Although it thus involves the fate of ages, yet the enemies to the real liberties of the people endeavour to inculcate an *indifference* in the minds of young men, on the present subject of politics. This apathy is often excited by men, who, from peculiar good fortune in their speculations, are *quarterly suckled* with maternal indulgence, from the breasts of the *funds*. While enjoying the copious bounties of these pecuniary establishments,

they vehemently exclaim against every investigation of those measures which raised them to their pre-eminent situation. Such men are desirous to dissipate the public mind, and artfully attempt to make it *disreputable for a young man* to concern himself with the affairs of government. They would confine his reflections within the narrow compass of the counter, and endeavour to persuade him that if he is capable of selling a *yard of English broadcloth*, or a *straw hat*, and make a regular statement to the Custom-house of the duties arising on them, his qualifications are sufficiently adequate to his employment in life. Thus these people are zealously disposed to stifle the manly energies of youth, and render them subservient to the stratagems of those who study to impose on them.

By this false mode of reasoning, an ascendancy is acquired over the well-informed young men in the commercial, agricultural and manufacturing occupations. A *partial*, monied interest is considered as the only proper director, both in church and state, and oftentimes the flippancy of some within the bar bears down all the natural good sense of the other professions. A preponderancy of influence is gained in the community by these facitious means, while the prominent features of our government are obliterated, by the *modest diffidence* of those who follow the beneficial employments of commerce, agriculture and manufactures.

Every private citizen is the guardian of his own and his country's honour—it is therefore a degrading idea, to imagine that the glory, prosperity and freedom of America, depend on the boasted wisdom, patriotism, superior abilities or integrity of any one class of citizens. The people, in their individual capacity, are the pledged trustees of the sacred treasures of the Constitution. They are the threshold through which the social compact was ushered into the sanctuary of the nation; the first paragraph announces this authority, by the powerful declaration of “WE THE PEOPLE.” The people are the *ark* in which the rights of society are deposited, and, whoever violates their prerogative, must expect to meet the fate of him who sacrilegiously trespassed on the holy building, while moving under the immediate auspices of the Supreme Being. *Vox Populi, Vox Dei*, more immediately applies to the American republic.

These are the sentiments which ought to invigorate every class of American youth, as their education intitles them to a full pre-

ponderancy in our political concerns. They should rise superior to the mere inspector of an *account current*, and should study the principles of the Constitution, as well as those political and commercial rights contemplated on its adoption. Thus informed, they would be enabled to *speak* and act on subjects relating to its establishment. *Not that the Young Men should neglect their private concerns, and become listless politicians*, but there is a dignity attached to every man's station in society, which should render him competent to judge on the utility of public measures. It is degrading to an American to take every thing on trust, and even the young farmer and tradesman should scorn to surrender their right of judging either to *lawyers* or *priests*; these professions ought to be duly estimated, but no man should so humble himself as to depend altogether on their *infallibility*.

If the federal constitution was avowedly adopted to enlarge the commerce of the United States, the question is, whether the surrender made to the English by the treaty, was calculated for this purpose? To determine this point, I shall compare the sentiments of our delegates in Convention and the principles promulgated by the merchants in their *Circular-Letter*, with certain articles of the British treaty. How far they are analogous will then appear; and whether the surrender of our *commercial rights*, in this instrument, will not ultimately have the most baneful operation on every American citizen. The principal object will be, to prove the *inconsistency* of men, in advocating a treaty which counteracted every principle they formerly espoused.

While considering this subject, I shall not aim at rousing your passions, but shall attempt to convince your judgment. If the pernicious tendency of admitting English subjects to an equal participation of our trade was deprecated by the gentlemen who forwarded the circular-letter, let me conjure you, my young friends, to reflect whether the consequences are not now equally fatal? If a *hawking Briton, or Scotchman*, can, by a parsimonious system of living, undersell you in your importations, how can you expect to acquire a competency for the maintenance of your wives and children, in your commercial connexion with Britain? The late treaty between Russia and Sweden is a document vastly apropos to this subject: it expressly stipulates, that "*travelling merchants and hawkers* of both nations shall not be suffered, but considered as

*smugglers."* If this article was necessary between Russia and Sweden, how much more so between Britain and America ?

To illustrate this question, I shall appropriate a few Numbers to consider the subject. If the Young Men finally say, that my plea is erroneous, I must acquiesce in their decision. I have no other object than their interest ; for whether *Humphrey Clinker* as a Scotchman, or *John Bull* as an Englishman, enjoy equal benefits with American citizens, in vending British manufactures, cannot essentially affect me. The only question is, whether the friends to the treaty, or the opposers of it, acted most consistent with the *commercial interest* of the country ?

The most illiberal reflections have been thrown on the individuals, who dared to come forward in opposition to its adoption ; let then the young citizens (who are deeply interested in its operation) judge between the friends and enemies of this derogatory instrument.

I am aware of the artful plea made by some of the Anglo-federalists, that, as the treaty is made, it is needless to remark on its inutility. This, however, is but a poor consolation. It is proper that we should know the folly of our conduct, even if we cannot immediately remedy the evil. It serves at least to bring to remembrance the strolling Street-Committee, with their pen, ink, and paper, threatening every one with vengeance who would not submit to their demands. It will serve to make the *Young Men* cautious how they trust to those who have thus far deceived them.

## No. XLIV.

### TO THE YOUNG MEN.

BY the most unaccountable fatality, those, who assumed the name of *federalists*, acquired an influence over the minds of the young American citizens. A system of terror was so generally established, that *fear* operated too powerfully for restraint. Political questions were not considered upon the ground of disquisition, but the adoption of particular tenets was enforced with a species of inquisitorial intolerance. If a young man dared to exercise his judgment, or to hesitate in subscribing to the infalli-

bility of certain dogmas, he was denounced under all that severity attached to the character of a disorganizer and jacobin. He was pursued in every direction with a malignity of temper, which threatened his ruin in business and personal reputation. An implacability of disposition was encouraged between citizens, and even the social intercourse was dissolved wherever a difference in political sentiments prevailed.

In this state of controversy, we cannot be surprized that the *young men* were borne down by the deluge of their opponents. To stem the torrent, required not only an energy of mind, but firmness of nerve. Personal safety in some instances was connected with political belief, as the bully would oftentimes become the oracle of public opinion; the brawny arm of a desperado would threaten to level an antagonist, when the voice of reason would make but little impression.

But, thank heaven, the clouds of delusion are dissipating: the period has arrived when each class of men can exercise their reason, and be guided by their unbiassed judgment. We can now speak unawed by the threats of a junto, who have too long claimed a prerogative to control both public and private opinion; we are restored to our ancient privileges, and each citizen stands in that dignified attitude peculiarly adapted to his situation in a republican government. We are *now* "all republicans," we are *now* "all federalists," as the system in which we move gives every man an *equal right* in society; there are no *exclusive republicans* or *federalists*, as it respects the privilege of judging: nor any *partial law* to arraign one set of opinions before the tribunal of vindictive judges.—There remains however a small convulsion (excited by the infuriated passions of some disappointed men); but, as it relates to the community at large, the hurricane has subsided, though from its *tail* a few gusts occasionally explode.

I have, in a previous Number, reminded you, my *young friends*, of the proceedings of the merchants of Boston, on the arrival of a few British factors, in the year 1785. At their meeting, they *solemnly declared*, that "the residence of such factors threatened an intire monopoly of all British importations in the hands of such agents, and would eventually deprive the *industrious American trader* of every benefit of our commerce." If, at this period, the introduction of British factors was so destructive to the commerce of

this country, what may be your apprehensions under the British treaty? If it was *then* considered "ruinous to the American trade" that such factors should reside among us, what must be the consequence when they have a *right by treaty* not only to reside, but "to purchase stores, houses, and shops"; to "remain *without limitation of time*"; to continue among us should we even be "in open rupture with England"; and, to complete the whole, provided their conduct should be such as to render them "*suspected as being enemies to the country*," have a right by treaty to remain "*twelve months*" before they can be removed, and, during this period of their enmity, are to enjoy every commercial privilege and advantage, equally with our own citizens? As a proof of this, examine the 14th and 26th articles of the British treaty.

If these are facts, let us pause for a moment, and reflect on the strange conduct of men, who deprecated the temporary residence of such factors in 1785, and, at the time of the treaty in 1795, were disposed to give these same persons such an uncontrolled monopoly of our commerce! Ten years, it is suspected, have as effectually changed their *sentiments* as they respect their *private interest*, as their present situation has altered the *objects* by which it is promoted. They were *then* attentive to *commerce*, they are *now* desirous of *revenue*; they were *then* living on *trade*, they are *now* living on *banks and funds*. It makes no odds to them, whether a strolling Scotchman or Englishman supports them, or an industrious young citizen of Boston. They care not, whether a *fellow-citizen* is the importer, (who has paid hundreds in taxes towards the maintenance of the town,) or an alien, who never paid a farthing. Whether the young *American* is the *sweeper*, or a Briton the *master* of a store, is but of little consequence to them;—give them their *quarterly payments*, and they are perfectly satisfied.

The foregoing observations are the true state of this business, and though they may at present be unnoticed, depend on it a few years will evidence the fact. Our *young men* will feel the effects of their duplicity, and those who have injured them will hereafter "mock at their calamity, and laugh when their fear cometh."

This catastrophe will sensibly touch the tender feelings of the *American ladies*, when they find temporary residents undermining the occupations of their husbands, and obliging them to retract their expenses within the narrow compass of a factor; when they find such



venders hiring a store, previously occupied by an American, and *living in the garret* in the most penurious manner, while retailing those commodities, on the sale of which many of our own citizens depend for a maintenance. Such persons are an injury even to the PURCHASERS ;—for though they may for the present sell cheaper than our own merchants, yet after they have monopolized the whole business by impoverishing others, and discouraged them from importing British manufactures, will finally take advantage of their exclusive trade, by an advance of 10 or 20 per cent.

Viewing this business even as it respects the *revenue*, it is greatly against the government of the United States. A man who is a stranger, may not be governed by those *cautionary principles* in his entries at the custom-house, as generally influence our own citizens ; a “ *point of honour*,” as it respects their private reputation, will naturally lead the *latter* to a just estimate of their invoice ; but the *former*, knowing that his residence is but temporary, calculates more upon the benefit he may obtain by defrauding the revenue, than the character he may sustain in consequence of paying the duties.

The foregoing observations are *plain truths*, though the manner of expressing them may be considered as uncourtly. If property is essential to respectability, certain it is, that a subject which contemplates the tendency of British factors in America, is worthy the attention of those who are immediately involved in its consequences.

As the British advocates in America exult at the pretended advantages gained by England over Russia (as an apology for our treaty) I shall, in my next Number, compare the treaty between those two nations, with that between America and Britain. The comparison will shew the fallacy of *federal reasoning*, both as it respects America and Russia ; for the fact is, Russia has obtained every advantage over England in the late controversy ; while the United States have sacrificed every neutral privilege by that injudicious deed emphatically called the British treaty.

## No. XLV.

## THE OMNIPOTENCE OF BRITAIN.

THE OMNIPOTENCE of the British nation has been so long a subject of exultation, and from political motives so generally admitted, that an attempt to place America in an attitude of opposition to her *marine mandates*, is considered by some, as the height of arrogance, if not of madness. But no country has been more overrated in its real commercial strength, provided other nations would exercise those natural advantages which they possess. The United States, by exaggerating the power of Britain, and lessening *their own energies*, have originated the errors they have committed, and substantiated the benefits obtained by England in our commercial negotiations. The *fears*, excited by the friends of the British treaty, that *war would be the consequence of refusing it*, were derogatory to our national character, as it exhibited a pusillanimity on our part, which stimulated Britain to further excesses. The declaration of our apprehensions of her resentment, and the *dread* we displayed at her prowess, led the government to pursue a system of depredation, unawed by any measures of retaliation from the American administration. Our language on that occasion was that of timidity ; we became supplicants to their clemency ; we openly *crouched* to the treaty, though we secretly detested its principles ; and thus governed by *fear*, we unfortunately surrendered every neutral right to the uncontrolled management of an expensive English judiciary.

So far from considering Britain as *omnipotent* either in her *marine*, *commercial*, or *manufacturing* station, I believe there is no power in Europe more completely *dependant*, as they relate to these particulars. Her *marine* depends greatly on Russia, and her *commercial* and *manufacturing* interests are principally supported by her connexion with America. The immense quantity of manufactures yearly *imported* into the United States, together with the *export* of our staple articles to the West-Indies, and within her own dominions, give such a balance of trade, in the various directions of her commerce, as would (if for a short time stopped) strike a fatal blow to the revenue and mercantile transactions of

that country. The benefits, arising from our commerce with England, are allowed by all the authors who have written on the subject, and the dread excited during the short period of our embargo, proves the propriety of its estimation in the American scale. Our embargo threw the whole exchange of London into consternation.

This principle was strongly urged in the State Conventions on the question of the constitution ; it was ever considered the *palladium* of our national importance. Mr. John Adams, (the late President) when in England, asserted, in my hearing, that the commerce of America was the most powerful weapon to attack Britain : and further declared, that if the United States would *unite* in a navigation act, that we could *force* the ministry to our own terms. These are sentiments which that gentleman vindicated when residing at the Court of St. James ; he regretted that no Commercial System was adopted by the American States, and often spoke with a degree of *enthusiastic confidence* on the power of this country to control the insolence of Britain.

England, instead of being *omnipotent*, is in the power of Russia and America, who could (in *alliance*) enforce their demands, upon the most extensive principles. These two countries are the *locks* which invigorate the strength of this vindictive Sampson ; a vigorous determination to maintain their neutral rights, would operate too powerfully on the *funds*, the *manufacturers*, and the *people at large*, to be treated with levity. It would press with a ponderancy which could not easily be shaken off, and the various interests of the British nation would experience such a convulsion, as to alarm the ministry for the political and commercial existence of the government.

The treaty, lately concluded between England and Russia, sufficiently evinces the apprehensions of England on the Northern Confederacy. Russia being the principal nation dreaded by Britain, the terms concluded on are highly favourable to the neutral position of that country. It is founded on liberal principles, and brings the business respecting the navigation of their respective subjects to a precise explanation ; it determines without any equivocation, the specific *articles of contraband* ; it declares in the most express manner, what characterizes a *blockaded port* ; that their vessels shall not be stopped but upon just cause, and *evident*

*fact* ; that the *right of search* shall be confined solely to *ships of war*, and shall never extend to *privateers*, or any other vessels, though armed for the purpose of war. Every precaution is taken to prevent any ill consequences by the meeting of their respective ships of war ; they shall keep out of the reach of cannon shot, and the commander of the belligerent vessel shall send a boat on board the convoying ship, and the utmost order and regularity are provided in proceeding on the examination. If there appears a *reasonable suspicion* for search, the commander of the convoy has a privilege to nominate and appoint one or more officers to assist in searching, which shall be done in his presence, conjointly with one or more officers named by the commander of the vessel of the belligerent party. If just and sufficient reason appear for detention, the commander of the convoying ship shall have power to *order* an officer to remain on board during its legal investigation, which shall take place in the *nearest and most convenient* port, and proceeded to with all possible dispatch. If, upon further examination, it shall appear that the said vessel was detained without just and sufficient cause, the commander shall be accountable not only to the owners of the *ship and cargo* for a full and satisfactory compensation for all *losses, charges, damages, and expenses*, occasioned by such detention, but shall be liable to *punishment for all acts of violence or any other fault*, which he may have committed.

These are the principal outlines of the Russian and British treaty. The parties are secured in their property by the most minute detail in all their procedure ; the *contraband* are specified ; the *search* limited ; the term *blockade* accurately defined ; and to prevent a wanton detention, the captors are liable to cost, damages, and punishment.

Where now is the boast of the Anglo-Federalists in the United States ? In what particular has England gained an advantage over Russia ? Their trade is admitted upon the most extensive principles, as it relates to the property of its own subjects ; nothing is left to chance in a court of law, nor depends on vague authorities, promulgated by interested judges. The treaty stands on a permanent basis, and the subjects of both countries know how far to pursue their commerce, by an inviolable guarantee, as to the articles of condemnation.

These Anglo-Federalists, while exulting at the advantages gained by Britain over Russia, absurdly eulogize the blessings of *our treaty with England*. If Russia is imposed on, what must be our situation? If their negotiation has increased the power of England over the sea, what must be the extent of our surrender? Nearly every point which is explicitly laid down in one, is omitted in the other; *our contraband articles* are extended; the term *blockade* is undefined; our trade is exposed not only to ships of war, but *privateers*; and to complete the whole, even if the capture is unjust, the poor American is *obliged to pay costs of suit*. In short, to compare the Russian treaty with the American, will give us the strongest abhorrence of this instrument.

We have not only surrendered those neutral rights guaranteed to Russia, but we have exposed ourselves to innumerable difficulties, attached to other articles in this compact. We have restrained ourselves from laying any further duties on their manufactures, without countervailing ones on their part; we have subjected ourselves to heavy demands for old debts, contracted by private merchants; we have placed English factors and temporary residents on a footing with our own merchants. We have, in fact, not only sacrificed our neutral commerce, but have foreclosed ourselves from using those means, which the commercial resources of this country abundantly furnish in case of future emergencies.—The truth is, we have *given up all* and *gained nothing*; we have established a pretended legal plea, which operates just as the judges see fit to use it. The treaty is the *doom's-day-book*, by which we are judged, and its terrors are denounced in almost every transaction since its adoption.

The subject is so mortifying, that it is wounding to the feelings of an American to contemplate it; yet, as it has produced consequences so fatal, it is our duty to lament over them, even though the reflections are poignards to our bosoms. It is a curse entailed on us and our children, and posterity will execrate its remembrance.

## No. XLVI.

## “THE RAINBOW, AND SCALPING-KNIFE.”

AFTER the British treaty was read in the Boston town-meeting, a respectable and venerable citizen inquired of the moderator, “*whether that was the whole of it ?*” On being answered in the affirmative, he made this shrewd reply : that “what he had heard was altogether in favour of the *British*, and he was in hopes of finding something in favour of *America*.”

It is expected that Mr. Gallatin, in his report to Congress on the state of the treasury, will give a *specific statement* of the expenses attending the British treaty ; how much money has been appropriated, and how much expended. We should be glad to hear particularly the issue of Mr. Gore’s embassy. He went to England at the earliest period of the treaty, and under the most sanguine expectation of success ; he returned to America, and has made a *second voyage* on this important business. To know the real blessings of this instrument, which was so strongly advocated by certain individuals, it would be a gratification to state the *debt* and *credit* on this whole transaction. If there has been any benefit we would wish to know it ; if the balance is in favour of the United States, or if the merchants have received any compensation adequate to the advances of government, we shall readily pay the most profound respect to the judgment of those gentlemen. Till this is done, every citizen has a right to judge for himself, and a few publications, supposed to be written by *Englishmen*, will never persuade the people that the treaty is not, precisely, what the venerable SAMUEL ADAMS declared it to be, i. e. “*pregnant with evil*.” The political foresight of this aged patriot will excite the plaudits of the historian ; while the contracted, despicable policy of its advocates will equally rouse his indignation.

As a proof of its deficiency (as it respects the *anticipations of the merchants*) we need only refer to the unsettled state of their claims, and the innumerable captures made of their property since its adoption. At the Old South Meeting-house, the friends of the treaty urged its adoption as the *immediate remedy* for their grievances ; give us the treaty, (said they) and you give us our

money. They placed the question, not as it related to a *national concern*, but as a controversy between the merchants of America and the British government ; the *treaty* and *their demands* were so connected, that they considered the opposition to one, equally an opposition to the other. When they had obtained the vote, they viewed it as a complete check on the bank of England for the full amount of their depredations, and the huzzas attending the decision were nearly equivalent to “ golden guineas ” from the Exchequer.

This is not an exaggerated statement of the expectations of the treaty-advocates, as I accompanied on that day many of them to the Exchange ; and their mutual congratulations on their success, were proofs sufficient to justify my observations. Nay, some of them *condescended* to speak to me on the subject, and wondered that I should be so opposed to *their interest* ; that I should be so *cruel* as to wish to deprive them of so many thousands of dollars, which they should now *certainly* obtain. I could not, even at this zenith of exultation, but pity their folly and smile at their credulity.

But the most curious part of this farce, was the *sublime* speech of Mr. Ames, in Congress. He rose in that august assembly, *apparently* under all the infirmities of a man in the last stages of dissolution ; he introduced his observations as the dying legacy of a departing patriot ; fatigued and almost expiring under the weight of his observations, he was obliged to stop at proper periods, and renew his strength by the assistance of a *smelling-bottle*. Under these impressions he ran through the horrid detail of “ *Indian scalping-knives* ; ” he portrayed with pathetic energy, the desolation of our fields, the conflagrated cities, the cries of frantic mothers and helpless orphans. He almost shook the sun in its stationary position, and nearly arrested the moon and stars in their career ; after exhausting his poetic fire, he at length *vented his pathos* on the *rainbow*, whose thousand tints were to expire under the agonizing expulsion of the British treaty. Such a complication of natural disorders to arise from a political cause, were unparalleled in the pages of history. No wonder that the citizens were alarmed ; if the British treaty convulsed the system of nature, we cannot be surprised that the inhabitants of the globe were interested in its adoption. If the sun was to be darkened, and the moon and stars were not to shed their light ; if the rainbow (the auspicious har-

binger of Supreme Benevolence) was to lose its radiancy, the consequences were too fatal to be sported with : If a weak, infirm man, just tottering over the grave, thus prognosticated such direful events from the rejection of the treaty ; or, like a second Noah, prepared it as the only alternative for the salvation of his fellow-citizens, the folly of our decision can be no otherwise apologized for, than the credulity attached to his infallibility.

But, fellow-citizens, at this age of reason, do we suppose the luminaries of heaven would have strayed from their orbits ? Do we apprehend that the planetary system would have been deranged in its revolution ? Do we think that the *milky way* would have confounded its brilliant pavement into chaos ? Or can we suppose, that the rainbow would have turned into a cloud of smoke, and all the variety of its magnificent texture be reduced to a huge mass of opaque atoms ?

This portrait may be considered as a strong colouring : but if we revert to the period of the treaty, we shall find it perfectly within the original. As a proof of which, read Mr. Ames's famous speech ; read the debates in the Old-South Meeting-House ; recur to the documents of that day in the Centinel and other federal papers ; and though we may *now* laugh at the idea *then suggested*, yet you will find them portrayed in all the publications which advocated the adoption of the treaty. Our judgment was not *then* the criterion of decision, but our *fears*, and a strange frenzy and political fanaticism pervaded every part of the community. If a man talked about the moon's being turned into blood, or the rainbow perverted into an omen of terror, we were led to adopt the wildness and extravagance of his fancy. The treaty ! the treaty ! was all the cry, and none were even *Christians*, but such as admitted its *efficacy* ; the pulpit, on many occasions, was the ecclesiastical drum, to rally disciples, apostles, and adherents. In short, the ratification was so interesting, that circular-letters were forwarded to be read after divine service.

The treaty, *federal gentlemen*, you have obtained ; the republicans opposed it ; and now, sirs, it is your duty to point out its utility. You said that compensation would be made for British depredations ; let me candidly ask you, whether you have received as much as you expected ? You said that our commerce would be more respected ; please to tell us wherein. Have not American vessels



been taken and condemned since, and upon as unreasonable pleas as before? Have not our sailors been impressed? Has not every imposition been equally practised in the British courts of admiralty? Tell us, *federal gentlemen*, what remittances Mr. Gore has made you, and what account he gives of his embassy; whether he is now in a way to liquidate your claims, and whether you soon expect him with *bills of exchange*, for the detention of your property? Let us know what advice you have received from Mr. King, and whether Pitt and Grenville are obliged to Mr. Ames for securing the lustre of the rainbow, by our adopting the treaty?

If such favourable events have taken place, we are desirous to know them, and we are willing to participate in your good fortune, by reciprocating our congratulations. But believe me, *federal gentlemen*, when I tell you that the whole is a delusion, and that you will find a party has deceived you. Time will convince you, that the opposers of the treaty *have been*, and *now are* your best friends. Mr. Jefferson's and Mr. Madison's political principles would have helped you, but a junto led you to spurn their proffered friendship. If you do not get compensation, you must blame the last administration.

I did propose, in this Number, to point out the impositions on our neutrality by Mr. Jay's treaty, but finding them so innumerable, I have thought best to call on its advocates to declare the commercial benefits they so confidently contemplated, and even pledged themselves would arise. If they are silent on this head, we are to presume they have never realized their expectations, that the whole was a series of federal deception, and solely calculated to root out, by means of agents and factors, every advantage of commerce, heretofore enjoyed by our citizens. The United States have been at a vast expense to fulfil their engagements, while we have reason to think that the money expended has been absorbed in parade and diplomatic ceremonies.

I would not suggest that Mr. Gore and others have not done all in their power to gain the five millions said to be captured: but the question is, what proportion of this sum has *bona fide* been received.

## No. XLVII.

## INTRIGUES OF THE JUNTO.

ALTHOUGH the *faction* in this country exclaim against the observations on the British treaty (as being *unnecessary since its adoption*) yet the tendency of its operation ought ever to be held up with detestation and abhorrence. This instrument has been the fatal engine to destroy every benefit contemplated on the success of our revolution. We flattered ourselves on the declaration of our independence, that our commerce would not hereafter be controlled by Britain; we then denied their right to lay even a three-penny duty on tea, and yet, within a few years after, have concluded a treaty subjecting our commercial property to their decisions. We are, if possible, in a worse situation *now* (as it relates to their marine mandates) than when we were colonies—we then fought for our commercial rights, and, in alliance with France, obtained them; but we have since surrendered the principal part of them, through the medium of an injudicious and impolitic negotiation.

To say that we ought now to let the treaty slumber in silence, or that it is an *old story*, and therefore it is best to drop it, are sentiments which may be peculiarly pleasing to the feelings of its authors and promoters, but “THE PEOPLE” of the United States, who will have to pay thousands to cancel British demands, should keep it in remembrance, while the “tablet of their memory” can retain an impression, or their minds are susceptible of indignation. It is so involved in our political and commercial concerns, that its mischievous properties will enfeeble the energy and vigour of our government. It palsies our exertions, and like a poisonous ingredient, contaminates the vital principles of our political and commercial existence.

To say that we ought to forget it, is to say, that we ought to forget the *fall of our first parents*; for if it is not *original sin*, it is *actual transgression*.

It is worthy of observation, that two of the greatest revolutionary characters in the United States expressed their disapprobation of the British treaty, nearly in similar language:—President

Washington said it was "*pregnant with events*," and Governour Adams declared it to be "*pregnant with evils*." The illustrious Washington, in the earliest stages of the business, was opposed to its ratification ; but such were the exertions and machinations of the friends to Britain, that we have reason to think this great and good man was deceived into the measure. He was encompassed by a host of partizans ; though their importunities were pressing and urgent, yet he refused for some time his assent. At length, after intercepting a letter to Mr. Fauchet, under all the aggravation which their almost blasted hopes excited, they instilled into the President a suspicion and resentment which led him to sign it in a hasty manner. It is generally believed, that President Washington would never have consented to its ratification if he had been left solely to his own judgment ; but the whole power of the party was bent to this purpose ; he was surrounded with so formidable a phalanx, that he must have been *more than a man* to have withstood their combined efforts. They rallied round him as their last desperate hope, and by intreaties, deception and hypocrisy, it is strongly suspected, that this patriot yielded, though reluctantly, to patronize this instrument.

The foregoing suggestions may be conjectural, but it has been observed by many who visited General Washington after his retirement, that he declined conversing on all political subjects, and that he appeared wholly disposed for solitude and retirement.—The *last will* of the General is a presumptive evidence of his disapprobation of the treaty ; for, though the integrity of his mind would not suffer him to violate it, after it was ratified, yet he seemed to dread the exposure of his successor to the intrigues of a party, in future diplomatic proceedings of a similar nature. The sentiments he advanced in that instrument, were in many instances in opposition to the treaty, as the peace and prosperity of the United States were in his opinion solely dependant on their own national energies, unhackled by any foreign interference to control their political or commercial transactions. If he was thus against any connexion which tended to weaken this strength, it is a strong presumption that he was not in favour of the British treaty.

"*The conclusion of this whole matter is*,"—a pretended federal party have, by various means, inticed some to accede to their intriguing schemes, to bring this country into an alliance offensive

and defensive with Britain, and thereby aid them in their projects against France. They have exaggerated every transaction of the French, and extenuated every action of the British; they have assumed the garb of federalism, and been foremost to resent the conduct of the French, and to soothe the passions as it respected the English; they pretended that the English government was friendly to our commerce and independence, and often expressed a concern for our happiness and prosperity. They were ever busy in our town-meetings, foremost on all public occasions, and when the COCKADE was the emblem of federalism, generally displayed a much larger signal than their brethren of this *black order*. But can any man suppose that such men were really friendly to the freedom, sovereignty and independence of America? Can we suppose that such men were sincere in their attachment to General Washington? Is it probable that all their former prejudice against him, as the commander of our army had subsided? that they had become *real Americans*, when many of them were receiving pay from the British government, as opposers of our revolution? Can any man think, that the whole body of refugees had been converted to the cause of American independence, and that they viewed their confiscated estates as lawful sacrifices for its obtainment? Could President Adams, when escorted through the country, or into Boston, console himself with a confidence in their integrity, when such a large number of the retinue were formerly his most implacable persecutors? Adams and a body of tories were an unnatural association? they might cry hofanna, or even strew the way with palm trees, yet when it was in their power they would carry him out of the city and crucify him; they might drink his health in bumpers, but, like Judas, they would betray him under the courtly salutation of a kiss. This display of friendship was never sincere; but was intended as a lure to sacrifice him after they had obtained his confidence and esteem.

This deceptive conduct, on their part, has been amply shewn in the late election for President. Mr. Adams's pretended friends were plotting his overthrow, even while they were exalting his political reputation. Some who were apparently the most zealous in his favour, were in league with those who were insidiously undermining his popularity. These same men would entertain Hamilton and eulogize his virtues, when at the same time they knew his

designs to turn out Adams and introduce Pinckney to the presidency. It is surprising how Mr. Adams should be deceived in such characters, when he had such constant evidences of their attachment to a man who had calumniated him in epithets the most degrading. If the charges of Hamilton were true, the hypocrisy of this party was the more glaring ; if they were false, the insult was doubly aggravating to Mr. Adams—and yet amidst this inconsistency, Mr. Adams appeared totally unapprehensive of their designs, but in the last stages of his administration appointed a great proportion of these persons to important offices. They may thank him for his civility to them, but even this kindness would not secure their affection to him.

Thus, fellow-citizens, have our patriots been deceived by a faction, and by others well known by the appellation of an “ *Effrajunto*,” who have industriously pursued their plans, by claiming the prerogative of exclusive federalists. Washington we have reason to think discovered their plots when it was too late to defeat them. His *last will* is a *legacy* which ought to accompany President Jefferson’s *inaugural speech*. In that instrument he speaks like himself, uncontrolled by any intriguing intruders. It is his DEATH-BED AD-MONITION, when no surrounding minions and hypocrites disturbed his mind. It is an appeal to God, and his conscience, and not intended to be made public, till he was in the fruition of heavenly happiness.

It is a melancholy reflection that the arts of this faction have so far involved our country in difficulties. They have tarnished the fame of many respectable patriots. But we trust in that BEING who often relieved us when in trouble, and we console ourselves that he has raised a Jefferson, who like Joshua will conduct us to the promised land.

## No. XLVIII.

THE FOLLY OF CLERICAL ALARMS; OR THE PLOTS  
DISCOVERED !!

THE various means used to effect such purposes, as would assist the faction in their designs to *involve this country in a war with*

*France*, are too numerous to be particularly recited at this period. Their aim was not confined merely to this object, but every measure was taken to raise a jealousy against certain republican characters who opposed their conduct. For this purpose the public mind was constantly alarmed upon the idea of an invasion from France. Conspiracies were daily announced ; tailor-plots, tub-plots, and even *lady-plots*, followed in rapid succession. Mr. Harper went so far as to pledge himself on the discovery of some terrific plan, which had nearly arrived to a completion ; he said in Congress, that he had the “clues,” and promised soon to disclose all the mysteries of a treasonable combination. The party went on from one species of alarm to another, till at length the cry of danger became so familiar, that the people considered it as the mere chimera of a disordered brain. Finding these projects would not answer their purposes, recourse was at length had to the all-powerful weapon of *religion*. This sacred cause was brought into operation ; the people were told, that all honour, honesty and morality were to be annihilated ; that deism, atheism and impiety of every kind were to predominate ; and to favour the deception, a few clergymen conjured up the exploded publications of Robison and Barruel, to forward their system of fanaticism. The *illuminati* was the *watch-word* of the party ; but the principal light arising from the subject, served only to make a certain Reverend Doctor appear more conspicuously ridiculous. Sermons were published on this occasion, and marginal notes introduced, with the horrid story of a desperate combination in Europe and America to overturn all that is called godly.

The *illuminati-influenza* lasted about eighteen months, and at length expired with a few struggles, under the injudicious management of this clerical operator.—Thus have this party run through the several parts of their political drama, and now are brought to their ne plus ultra, which is, *that the President is an infidel, and does not believe in the Christian religion.*

This is the only ground on which the party now stand, and while they think the people believe them, they take the greater liberty in their calumny and detraction ; they alternately call him deist, infidel, and atheist ; they represent him as having a design upon the religious establishments of our country, and some are so foolish as to believe, that all the meeting-houses will soon be razed,

the ministers discarded, and carnage and plunder become the "order of the day."

At this enlightened age, it is almost an affront upon the good sense of the citizens of the United States, to reply to the many absurdities written against the President on this subject. If Mr. Jefferson is destitute of those virtues which constitute a Christian, or a citizen, where is the man who is possessed of them? If honesty, integrity, forbearance, humanity, benevolence and patriotism are the prominent features which designate a Christian, certainly no man within the United States stands more conspicuously eminent. So far from having *no religion*, he is a friend to ALL; and instead of contracting its influence, he is desirous of giving every citizen a right to worship God in his own way; he is not a persecutor of any sect; he is not a defamer of any particular mode of worship; he is not a fanatic, to scourge those who do not believe in his tenets; he leaves every conscience to its own bias, and instead of controlling men as the arbiter of revelation, he is anxious to place the adoration of the SUPREME BEING and his attributes, on that basis of the human mind, on which alone it can or ought to be erected.

If this is the character of the President, why is he attacked with such severity and indecency? Why is he held up as the *subverter of religion* when he gives such ample scope to every principle connected with its establishment? If he injures no man in his religion, why should others injure him in his reputation? If he is an immoral man, point out his immoralities; if he is destitute of the Christian virtues, let them be specified in such a manner as the people may judge of his criminality; if he has destroyed any houses of worship, or disturbed any pious assembly, let the circumstances be related; if he is profane, let the instances appear. This mode of procedure would be candid; but to defame the chief magistrate under the vague appellations of deist, atheist, and infidel, is unbecoming the character either of a Christian, gentleman, or citizen.

If some of the clergy are opposed to him, it would be more honourable to state their charges. If he has violated the laws of society, why do they not come forward in an explicit manner, and give the public a narrative of the whole transaction? This line of conduct would appear more manly than to attempt to

weaken the confidence of the citizens in his administration by invidious surmises.

The conduct of Mr. Jefferson through life has been peculiarly amiable : His writings are fraught with benevolence, and solely intended to ameliorate the condition of mankind, and to lead them to an improvement of all those faculties with which heaven has blessed the human species. His character, in Europe, stands in the most elevated position, and it is degrading to our country to find men, who assume the reputation of "the learned," demean themselves by such gross reflections as are daily published in the Palladium, Centinel, and other papers.

If the clergy are alarmed at the decay of religion, can it have any salutary effect to represent Mr. Jefferson as the opposer of the christian system ? Will it persuade people to embrace the gospel, by telling them that Mr. Jefferson rejects it ? It rather appears to me, that it has a contrary tendency—no man will *believe* merely because Mr. Jefferson *disbelieves*. His character as a *scholar*, *philosopher*, and *reasoner*, gives him a reputation too high to be made the negative of a principle, either of religion or any other subject. If the people are told, that the President does not believe the Christian religion, it may lead many to conclude, that *he knows more than they*, and that he has good reasons for his disbelief. This kind of argument may be satisfactory to some, and thus, instead of helping the cause of religion, it may have a very unsalutary effect. The clergy in this particular are doing an injury to the cause they are attempting to support, and it is the height of folly to expect to gain proselytes by propagating with so much avidity the infidelity of Mr. Jefferson.

As President of the United States, he is not called on to make a declaration of his religious creed ; if he was, I am persuaded the most orthodox would not condemn it. General Washington was peculiarly careful in this particular ; among the variety of his publications we find but little to lead us to a conclusion of his religious tenets ; and as the constitution does not even suggest any TEST of this kind, it is proper that the President should not bring himself forward in any point of view on this ground. He is not called on to administer any religious ordinances, and while he intermeddles with no particular sect, and promotes the rights of



all, neither the clergy nor other individuals have a right to censure him for his own sentiments.

Suppose the President should make a declaration of his firm persuasion of the truth of the gospel, still a difficulty would remain among his opposers as to the *particular tenets* he maintained ; some would say, that he was a Roman Catholic, others that he was an Armenian ; some a Calvinist—in short, Socinians, Quakers, Baptists, Universalists, Swedenbourgians, and Sandemanians, would be clamorous to know to what *doctrine* he adhered. His declaration, therefore, as to his belief in the Scriptures, would not remedy the evil, for points of faith are as often contended for, as the avowal of a general principle. If religion is to be brought forward in this controversy, the President is perfectly right in keeping his creed to himself.

But why is this apprehension excited, that Mr. Jefferson is opposed to the Christian system ? No part of his administration has had the most distant tendency to injure it ; since his election “all things remain as they were” as it relates to the church ; we go to meeting with as much order as usual, and return home without the least molestation ; our sabbaths are equally hallowed ; the *first* and *second bells* ring with as much solemnity and regularity as formerly ; we baptize our children with as much reverence as ever ; the clergy are as much respected, as well paid, *dine out as frequently*, and in most instances frolic as often as under the late administration ; *ordinations* are announced in our papers with their usual reverence, and there is as much *good cheer* on such occasions as in days of old. Where then is the mischief ? Where the danger, when nothing has taken place to discompose the most devout in their religious exercises ? If we are disposed to religious duties, Mr. Jefferson will not disturb us ; only let the clergy mind their business, and I doubt not he will mind his. If some of them do not choose to pray *for him*, it would be decent not to bray *at him*. The blessings of Providence are not partial, and though the enemies of the President may not think proper to remember him at the Throne of Grace, yet we trust he is not dependant on their clemency, (though clothed in sacerdotalis) but on the benevolence of the Supreme Being. To HIM we commit him, and it does not require

the benediction of his adversaries to secure him a continuance in His holy keeping.

While speaking of the clergy, I do not mean to include the *whole order*, as being thus opposed to the President ; a *large proportion* of them, I am persuaded, reprobate the indecent publications which have appeared against him. As an order in society I shall ever respect them ; but there are a FEW who have acted a part, which upon serious reflection they cannot justify to God, nor their own consciences. If such men would be *more circumspect in their own conduct*, and attend more to the duties of their own profession, the cause of religion would be more effectually supported, than by their calumny against the President. When he is as inattentive to his duty as *President*, as they are as *clergymen*, it will be time for the people to find fault.. Mr. Jefferson never gave such a strong evidence of his disbelief in scripture as they have of the *negligence of their parish* ; and if they are serious to propagate the gospel, it is incumbent on them to act more consistent with its principles. The *Geography* of this world is not the “ one thing needful,” neither are the “ *graces*” of *Chesterfield*, an appropriate study for a clergyman ; less attention, therefore, to sublunary concerns, and more to heavenly, are highly becoming a christian teacher. While such men are charging the President with infidelity, they should examine their own conduct, and possibly, upon reflection, they would find the remainder of their lives could not be better spent, than in correcting their former imprudencies.

## No. XLIX.

### ON 'THANKSGIVING.

“ *It is the LORD's doing.*”

THE benevolence of Providence, in its various dispensations towards this country, is a subject which ought ever to excite the serious contemplation of the citizens of the United States. From the first settlement of America, the kind hand of heaven has directed us in the way in which we should go. Next to the *chosen nation*, America stands the peculiar care of the SUPREME BEING, and if

miracles have not been wrought in her favour, yet the interposition of the Almighty has been so often displayed, that we must be lost to every rational reflection not to acknowledge his benignity and superintendence.

On this day, citizens of Massachusetts, we are requested to acknowledge with *thankfulness*, the kindness and protection of HIM, who governs the world, and who so accurately adjusts its various operations, as to produce "seed-time and harvest, summer and winter." By His goodness, we are furnished with all those comforts which render existence happy, and which console us under every trouble and misfortune, incident to human life. *This year*, in a particular manner, may we exultingly say, "that the fig-tree has blossomed, and that fruit has been in our vines; that the labour of the olive has not failed, and that the fields have yielded their meat; that our flocks have not been cut off from the fold, and that there has been an abundance of herd in the stalls." While contemplating these blessings, may we all thankfully response,—we will "rejoice in the Lord, and joy in the God of our salvation."

While we adore the SUPREME BEING for granting us those special bounties of his benevolence, may we be led to contemplate his mercies, as they respect our *national happiness*. That this country has been exposed to the distressing consequences of war, we have proofs of the most authentic nature. Mr. Tracy, in Congress, urged "*a war of extermination*;" the question of war was solemnly debated in that august assembly; the young men were called on to place themselves in an hostile attitude, and artificial means were used to make their "*blood boil*," to invigorate their prowess. The tory party were active throughout the Union, to kindle the torch of Mars, and every incentive which could rouse the passions, was applied, with the most artful address, to bring America into an open rupture with the French nation. An *Orator* in Boston vaunted in his heroism, and under the smoke of public infatuation, and inflated with his own vanity, declared, in his oration, that "*peace must be obtained at the point of the bayonet!*" This was the "spirit of the times" at the day of federal fanaticism. If a prudent man paused at the adoption of such violent measures, he was cried down as a jacobin. The tories completely assumed the whig ground; they rejoiced at the prospect of involving the Unit-

ed States in a war with France, and connecting them in an alliance with England.

But, *it is the Lord's doing*, that we were not plunged into that dreadful vortex, which such measures would have quickly hurried us. Suppose Mr. Tracy's "war of extermination" had been adopted, or the *heroic lawyer's* proposition, for "peace at the point of the bayonet" had been acceded to, what would have been our present situation? Instead of rejoicing, we should have to mourn; instead of a *thanksgiving-day*, we should have been obliged, (from the present state of Europe) to set apart this day for "fasting, humiliation, and prayer."

"*A war of extermination!*" gracious heaven! Five millions of Americans at war with thirty millions of Frenchmen!! Not only so, but probably with all the European powers in alliance with that nation.—"*A peace at the point of the bayonet!*" dreadful alternative! that the slaughter on such a preliminary should be the *sine qua non* of our public quietude. How infatuated must such men have been, to place America in so barbarous a position—five millions of people to demand the blood of thirty millions! How desperate must have been our condition, that the whole nation of France must atone for our resentment.

In this contest, what must have been the fate of the United States? After France had made peace with England, we *alone* must have met them, *consolidated* in all their energies? If Britain was alarmed at their invasion, what must have been our apprehensions? If the "wooden walls of England" were not a security, what could we expect from the few bulwarks we could oppose to their incursions? Admit that the people of the United States would have defended themselves on their shores, yet the horrid carnage that must have ensued chills the blood of the *humane* citizen to contemplate. If we are equal to every assault from abroad, yet the folly of those who were desirous to plunge us into "a war of extermination," or to make "peace at the point of the bayonet," must be evident to every reflecting mind.

Under the fanatic impulse of these times, none but the Supreme Being could prevent the dreadful calamity. It was "*the Lord's doing*," that we were thus saved from the horrid catastrophe of a war with France; "*if the Lord had not been on our side*," we may now say, we should have been surrounded with dangers

and distresses from which we could not have been extricated without the greatest difficulty. HE has appeared for our relief ; HE has frustrated the designs of our enemies, and rendered their machinations of no effect. Mr. Tracy was a representative from Connecticut, but we hope the *religious sentiments* of his constituents will not justify him in his savage ferocity. Would nothing short of the extermination of thirty millions of the human species satisfy his sanguinary disposition ? Must the blood of a whole nation be shed to appease his vindictive indignation ? If France had displayed the same temper, and called for the *extermination of every American*, what must have been the consequences of so terrible a conflict ? Or if the *powerful* Bonaparte had assumed the dictatorial language of the Boston Orator, that "peace with America must be made at the point of the sword," how afflicting would have been the controversy to decide the principles of an amicable negotiation ? Such ignorance exhibited in Congress, and such folly in a Boston town-meeting, by men whose malignity of heart was the only criterion of their judgment, are expressive of the rage of party, and evince the dreadful precipice, on the brink of which, the fate of America was suspended. The violence of the political agitation, urged on by the frenzy of a faction, placed our country in the most critical attitude. The crisis was important, and nothing short of the interposition of Providence stopped us in our career to pass the Rubicon, commence the horrid carnage of exterminating war, and make a "peace at the point of the sword."

But, thank heaven, "the snare is broken and we have escaped" ; the annual tribute of praise is now due to that BEING, by whose goodness we have been preserved. With thankful hearts, we offer Him our unfeigned love and adoration, for the blessings we have experienced the past year ; and though the destroying angel has swept away many of our fellow-citizens in other States, yet we have still the greatest reason to exalt, and magnify His name.

This anniversary pleads strongly in favour of PEACE, and every social circle is a manifesto of the blessings arising from it. See the venerable parent surrounded with his numerous family, while joy, health and plenty crown the festive board ; the sprightly

amusements, the friendly conversation, the pleasing harmony and reciprocal congratulation,—all, all proclaim, that the melodious accents of peace are more desirable than the hoarse clarion of war. Let the mind for a moment contemplate the reverse of this enchanting scene—instead of the social circle, let us introduce the mourning widow and fatherless children, deploring the loss of a husband and parent, fallen at “the *point of the sword*”—instead of the pleasing endearments of domestic conviviality, let the horrid tale of conflagration, slaughter and death (the dreadful attendants of a “*war of extermination*”) become the topic of conversation—instead of the infant, prattling on the knee of a fond parent, let us portray the lisping babe mingling its tears with the disconsolate mother. These are but the faint outlines of the distressing picture.

Here fancy intrudes her suggestions. During the sanguinary period of war, we might observe the pampered contractor, whose per centum stands in competition with the happiness of his country—the unprincipled speculator, who is living on the injuries of an unfortunate soldier; a clan of favoured sycophants, who to obtain employment, would sacrifice every principle of honour and honesty; a group of myrmidons, who under pretence of supporting government, would offer themselves as tools to enslave their fellow-citizens; a junto of proud officiates, who, rioting on the emoluments of their appointments, would, if possible, overthrow the constitution, if there should be virtue enough in the President to displace them. Such circles might experience the benign efficacy of war; and while the industrious body of the people were groaning under the weight of taxes, the festive board of such gluttons might resound with songs of mirth, in adoration of their patron.

As men and citizens, our devotion on this day naturally embrace the superintendence of Providence. Under this impression, it is our duty to approach the altar with every expression of gratitude; no party spirit ought to disturb that christian tranquillity, which should distinguish its professors. The pulpit, on such occasions, should not become as *terrible* as Mount Sinai, but be used as the medium through which the discordant passions should be allayed; charity towards each other, on religious points, should be exercised; no censure should be cast on a sister state for their reli-

gious scruples ; abusive epithets should be avoided ; *union* inculcated ; the Constituted Authorities respected ; and thus, harmonizing in our thanksgiving and devotion, we may anticipate "*peace on earth, and good will towards men.*"

---

## No. L.

PEACE AND FUNDS, *versus* CENTINEL.

"*The national debt of Great-Britain is enormous on paper ; and has been a fruitful source of materials for the jacobin Maginnettes to deceive the public with. But nationally considered that debt is merely nominal.—It is due from the nation to individuals ;—and individuals form the nation. If the intire debt were paid off at this moment it would not add a shilling to the wealth of the nation ; nor a sensation to the stock of its general happiness. On the other hand, were it to be wiped off entirely with a sponge, it would not cause fifty individuals in the whole kingdom to retrench one meal a day in their subsistence.*" Centinel.

"*The intelligence of peace, received here a fortnight since, has been questioned at the Southward. It is nevertheless TOO TRUE.*" ib.

ALTHOUGH the most violent acrimony and malevolence are displayed in the *tory gazettes* against the President, yet it must afford him the highest consolation, that such publications do not originate in Boston, but are taken principally from a paper which is considered as the immediate successor of Peter Porcupine.—That there is a faction lurking in this *metropolis*, opposed to every republican principle of the constitution, is too apparent to be controverted ; but even this traiterous combination are obliged to keep themselves concealed, and instead of openly avowing their designs, are driven to the "*imperious necessity*" of using *foreign means* to effect their purposes. It must be admitted as an incontrovertible truth, that the observations in these gazettes are the expiring struggles of a faction, and the republication of them in our papers, are the paltry ebullitions of a few unprincipled Editors, who, in the

*reign of terror*, wantonly pledged their credit on the validity of their political predictions. Finding, however, that the *Corfican hero* has brought their "*best of kings*" to sue for peace—that the *continent* of France, stands on a commanding eminence over the *island* of Britain—that *Citizen Otto* is on a level with *Lord Hawkesbury*; that the Tower guns as readily discharge their sonorous exultations on the *issue* of the war, as when they resounded to the tune of "Rule Britannia, rule the waves"—that they as readily announce the arrival of a French missionary, to settle the definitive articles of peace, as they formerly did to denounce the jacobins of that victorious nation; and, that the English "*populace*" as readily took out the horses and drew the carriage of a *Frenchman*, as ever they did that of one of the *royal family*. When they find that such events have taken place, the Anglo-federalists of the United States have recourse to such fugitive observations as a defeated enemy in their retreat are pleased to furnish them.

These British troops, residing in America, are arranged in various directions—one part is assigned to abuse the President, another to calumniate Mr. Gallatin; a few are foolish enough to *flatter* Mr. Gallatin, as if his integrity and knowledge could be biased by such sycophancy; another detachment is rallied for the express purpose of censuring every removal from office; some to create a jealousy between the northern and southern states, while others take a more extensive ground by pretending to exult at the advantages gained by the British in the treaty of peace. But not calculating an uniformity in sentiment on this subject, they unfortunately counteract each other in their statements—while some *rejoice* at the event, others *lament* the tidings as "*too true*." Russell takes the latter ground, and yet in the same Centinel proclaims the "*glorious news*," that Britain has gained every benefit by the issue of the war; that her stocks are in high estimation; that the English "*omnium*" is more valuable than the French *gatherum*; that the British have "*not lost a foot of ground*;" and yet, strange to relate, even in the midst of his boastings on the advantages of peace, the Editor closes his narrative with a mournful sigh, Alas, it is "*too true*"!

If the English have obtained these great advantages by the peace, why should their friends express an uneasiness at the close



of this European controversy ? Why should they lament the issue of a war, provided the preliminary articles are altogether in their favour ? If Pitt is satisfied, if Fox says it is a good treaty, if the people of England have become a body of *illuminati*, by *illuminating* every capital city in the kingdom, why should the *Centinel* become the only mourner ? Rachel, weeping for her first-born, could not express herself with more disconsolate dejection than this poor Editor : in the midst of the universal hilarity, we hear his discordant vociferation, Alas, it is “too true” ! Whilst thus “refusing to be comforted,” it was expected some emblem of grief would have expressed his condolence ; whether a *black cockade*, or a display of black crape on the *horns of the roasted ox in Liberty-Square*, would have been exhibited by him and his distressed associates, were the doubtful suspense of those who have long laughed at his ignorance and folly.

How must the faction in America have been mortified, had they seen *Citizen Lauriston* drawn in his coach by the *English mobility* through the street of St. James ! Alas, this also is “too true.” How would they have stared to observe the populace in Bristol welcome the London mail, which brought the pleasing intelligence of peace, and, after taking out the horses, drag it amidst the acclamations of thousands to the Bush tavern ! Alas, this is also “too true.” How would they have been terrified to behold the French convalescents leap from their hammocks, and dance upon the *main deck* of their prison ships ! But above all, how great must have been their mortification to find, that the “immortal” *Peter Porcupine* had his *office demolished*, by the London populace, for his *refusal to illuminate* ! Alas, these are all “too true.”

Consistency is a principal trait in a political character. The Centinel, even while deploring that war had ceased, is gasconading, that the English 5 per cents. stand at 95 dollars to a hundred ; that they have “not lost a foot of ground ;” that “the ships taken at Toulon are not returned,” &c. But the chagrin arises amidst these pretended congratulations on British advantages, from the 15th article of the treaty, which evidently shews that the terms were *dictated in Paris*, viz. “The present preliminary articles *shall* be exchanged at London in the space of 15 days at farthest” ;

—that “plenipotentiaries *shall* be appointed to proceed to an arrangement of the definitive treaty, in concert with the *allies* of the contracting parties.” Pray, inform us who are *the allies* on the part of the British, to give their weight in the Convention at Amiens? Alas, it is “too true,” they will have but little help from this quarter. This treaty carries further marks of French supremacy—the “First Consul of the Republic,” stands before “HIS MAJESTY, the King of the United Kingdoms of Great-Britain and Ireland.” This certainly looks a little “*squally*,” that *Citizen Bonaparte* should take rank of *His Majesty* George the III<sup>d</sup>. Who could *dictate* this *jacobinical* arrangement in the articles? Is it probable, if the treaty was in the least degree under the control of the English ministry, that they would have suffered the name of a “Corsican usurper,” to be mentioned before that of their *rightful* sovereign? This is contradicted in the Centinel, but as both the French and English papers published the treaty in this form, we have reason to believe it is agreeable to the original. The farce, however, does not end here, for it is “done in London, on the 9<sup>th</sup> Vendemiaire, and 10<sup>th</sup> year of the French Republic;” thus obliging the English to acknowledge, within the British capital, the freedom, sovereignty and independence of the French nation.

It looks then as if the glory of the British nation was “burning to the water’s edge.” How the “*rainbow*” will appear after this event, is apocryphal; it may brighten, or it may lose its lustre; and as this luminary has heretofore been summoned to take an active part in our political controversy, it is hoped that the *almanack-makers* in the several States will describe with the utmost accuracy in their next year’s publications its variation as to the extent of its *arch*, or the brilliancy of its rays.

For my own part, I read the Centinel, Palladium, and Price Current, merely to observe the chagrin of the Essex junto. Even their exultations are evidences of their mortification. If in one paragraph they state the advantages of the English by the treaty of peace, I am sure to find that the next will declare the falsity of their reasoning. They strain every nerve to vindicate themselves; they amuse us with a pretty story about “*omniums*;” they describe the British funds as rising to an immense value; but before their readers are well prepared to join the chorus, they

blast their own information by anticipating some terrible forebodings, which intirely destroy the luxury of their repast. "They build up with one hand, and knock down with the other."

In the present state of politics, I am almost persuaded to *condescend* to ask *Major Russell* (this *Necker* of finance) to explain his farrago of the British debt, when he says, "if it were to be wiped off intirely with a *sponge*, it would not cause fifty individuals in the whole kingdom to retrench one meal a day in their subsistence." If this hypothesis is right, the American debt could be as easily wiped off as the British; the national debt of both nations stands on the same basis; the doctrine advanced in the *Centinel* applies equally to both countries. What then will the stock-holders in the United States say to this *Centinel* mode of financeering? How would they relish this *sponging manner* of settling their claims?—If we should have published a similar paragraph in the *Chronicle*, and instead of *Britain* inserted *America*, the 6 and 8 per cent. creditors would have reason to reprobate the principle; if such *disorganizing* sentiments had been advanced by the republicans, the anathemas of every stock-holder would have followed them with the most clamorous vociferation. The *Centinel*, by the ignorance of its projectors, has sunk too low in public estimation to require a *serious* reflection on its numerous absurdities. If we should hold them strictly to their own declarations, the funds of the United States would be converted to very different purposes than paying their creditors.

As a friend to the honour and national character of America, I hope never to see such principles operate in this country, as to place the creditors under the tyranny of a "sponge"—PUBLIC CREDIT IS THE ENERGY OF GOVERNMENT; republicans should ever attend to their finances in such a manner, as to give confidence to its citizens in their loan of money. Whatever contracts are made on this basis ought to be tenaciously fulfilled; THE CREDIT OF A NATION IS AS SACRED AS THAT OF AN INDIVIDUAL; so far from "sponging," I am for punctual and honourable payment; so far from suggesting that no injury would arise from *annihilating* the debt, I believe the greatest injury would arise if such a measure was adopted.

The observations made in the *Centinel*, on the public debt of England, are the very essence of *jacobinism*. The Editor, from his arrogance, seems to sport with every thing that is held valuable in society ; he speaks of peace as a curse, of the public debt as a chimera, and yet, under a political infatuation, he is supported (by the very men whom he wishes to ruin) as the friend to public credit and the advocate of harmony and social order ; while, on the other hand, the Editors of the *Chronicle* have been represented as the destroyers of property and the enemies to every moral virtue.

The *Chronicle* has now come to an issue with the *Centinel* on this ground, and means to maintain an opposite doctrine. If the debt of England is a mere *ignis fatuus*, the principle is equally operative in the United States. The REPUBLICANS will not admit public credit to be exposed to such a vague decision, but are willing in a just manner, (by the burden falling equally on every class of citizens) to pay their creditors, agreeably to their pledged contracts, any thing in the *Centinel* to the contrary notwithstanding.

Suppose Mr. Jefferson or Mr. Gallatin had advanced a similar doctrine on the debt of the United States, as is advanced in the *Centinel* on the British debt—suppose they had said, that the debt was due from one individual to another, and, therefore, if a “ sponge ” was applied to the settlement, not more than fifty individuals would retrench one meal a day in their subsistence ? If this is true of England, it is equally applicable to America ; and, provided it was adopted, how many *fat, plump stock-holders* would become as thin and as lank as a pack of hounds, after coursing a whole day without any game to satisfy their hunger. Away, away with such *jacobinical principles* ; the *Centinel* is aiming to throw “ public credit in the wind ” to help its disorganizing adherents—but the *Chronicle*, ever steady to its object, will pursue such renegades to their secret holds, and expose them to public execration.

## No. LI.

## RAIN AND WAR !!!

*"We have as much reason to pray for the continuance of the WAR in Europe, as the Husbandman for rain in a time of drought."*

Centinel,

ALTHOUGH personalities ought ever to be avoided, yet when an individual has the effrontery to violate every principle of humanity ; disgraces his country, by holding it up as the residence of barbarians ; agonizes the tender feelings of charity and philanthropy ; and libels every doctrine of that religion, which breathes peace and good will towards men—the affront is so enormous, that *the man* who thus sports with every thing considered sacred in civilized society, should be arraigned before the public as a culprit, whose crimes deserve the most pointed reprehension.

Under this impression, I am constrained to inquire from whence does this sanguinary sentiment proceed ? *"To pray for War as earnestly as we would pray for Rain !"* Desolation, barbarism, and conflagration, must stand personified in the author of such an infamous address to that Deity, whose attributes are immutably fixed on the basis of benevolence.

Where is the wretch who dares utter such a profane sentiment ? Has Cain returned to the earth, or has Judas escaped from the confines of Lucifer ? Has ATE "let slip the dogs of war," and commissioned an emissary to enrage the voracious pack to gluttonize on human carnage ? Has Pandæmonium disgorged its demons, and disturbed the peaceful abodes of mankind with its infuriated residents ? Have the savages of the wilderness become more vindictive in barbarism ? or have the Algerines been inflated with a tenfold degree of satannic malignity ?—No :—Even Cain, Judas, Até, Belzebub, the savages, Algerines, and Satan himself, must reprobate with abhorrence the detestable idea ! and collected in their ire, point the finger of scorn at the miscreant who thus

presumes to violate every principle which is held sacred even in the territories of the most profligate. Who is the man who thus disgraces humanity ; who puts to blush the apostates in the infernal regions ; and who raises the indignity of the most uncivilized of mankind ? The countenance of Cain must brighten at the reflection, that *one man* will hereafter stand more conspicuous for his depravity in the regions to which he is consigned.

“ *Pray for war as earnestly as we would pray for rain !*” Gracious Heaven, let not thy wrath descend on America for this horrid imprecation. It is the supplication of a wretch, who has lost all sense of thy benevolence. It is the intreaty of a “ biped,” who regards neither the sanctity of the Supreme Being, nor the happiness of mankind. Let not the vengeance of Heaven fall on our country for this impious expression, as upwards of five millions of citizens unanimously condemn the desperado who thus violates every principle which harmonizes society, or renders life desirable. But if an atonement must be made for this impeachment of thy benignity, let him stand the sole victim of thy displeasure ; and may the miseries which he is disposed to inflict on others, be heaped with manifold aggravation on his devoted head. Not that we would wish to prolong his misery to the extent of his crime ; but, in mercy to mankind, may he receive such a portion of affliction, as that his name may henceforth be expressive of every thing that is abhorrent, and his punishment become so far terrific, as to check similar expressions in succeeding ages. In commiseration to the human race, may Satan be controlled in executing the full vengeance of his indignation, as the *rivalship of depravity* may excite those emotions of jealousy, as to lead him to dread an usurper of his kingdom.

The profane sentiment, of imploring Heaven to prolong the devastations of war, must strike every reflecting mind with detestation. Can any man, whose breast is not callous to every humane consideration, desire a continuance of those ravages which attend the progress of war ? Is there one citizen, who delights so far in blood, as to petition Heaven to spread the dreadful carnage among the innocent inhabitants of contending Europe ?—who wishes to read the horrid detail of expiring millions, falling under the sword of an invading enemy ? Is there one man so absorbed in private interest, as to make a serious application to the Deity

to distress thousands of men, women, and children, merely to procure a market for his merchandize ? Let those Americans, who recollect the battle of Bunker-Hill, who remember the conflagration of Charlestown, who experienced the distresses of forsaking their habitations during the American revolution, speak on this subject ;---say, fellow-citizens, what would have been your feelings, if you had read in an European paper, that the war with America was as desirable as “rain in a time of drought” ? What should we have thought of such a paragraph, even if it had proceeded from the press of an Algerine ? But no such thing ever appeared during our controversy ; the inhumane sentiment was reserved for the *Centinel*, and we presume its Editor stands alone possessed of such a sanguinary disposition !

He says we ought to “*pray for war !*” Gracious Heaven ! in what manner are we to direct our prayers ? Are we to assemble, as in a time of drought, and make our immediate application to the Throne of Grace, for the bestowment of this blessing ? Must our clergy address the Deity in a language like this :---“Father of Mercies, we beseech Thee to hear our supplications, and may Thy children here below, who inhabit one part of the creation, be enabled to cut each other’s throats, in order that the inhabitants of the other part may receive the benefits arising from their wants and distresses.” Is this the form of prayer the *Centinel* would prescribe ? Is this the pious ejaculation to be offered up in our respective churches ? Horrid profanity ! and yet this is the purport of the petition recommended for your adoption.

Viewing this subject on the ground of Christianity, can the clergy approve of the principle ? Are they not *in duty bound* to bear public testimony against the wretch who would suggest such a measure ? Can politics so far blind their eyes, as to pass over unnoticed such an odium on religion, while they are lamenting the decay of every moral virtue ? This paragraph in the *Centinel* is a stain on our national character ; and nothing can ever remove it, but the depravity of the author being as generally known throughout the world, as his insolence is notorious within the town of his residence.

If any one doubts the infidelity of this man, I would request him to inquire, who it was that declared, upon hearing that the lightning had shivered the mast of the ship *George Washington*---

ton, "*This is a d---d jacobin storm !*" Was it not the same person who wishes us to "*pray for war ?*" That laments the peace as "*too true ?*"

The above remarks are confined to the horrid idea of "praying for war." If the author is willing to acknowledge his error, and apologize for his impiety, the charity of republicans would probably throw a mantle over his criminality, under the injunction in Scripture, that "though thy brother offend seventy times seven, yet, if he *repent*, ye shall forgive him." To this Christian charity we recommend the *writer of the sanguinary paragraph.*

## No. LII.

### THE ABOLITION OF TAXES.

THE magnanimity, philanthropy and patriotism exhibited in the message of President Jefferson, must endear him to every republican and *Christian* citizen, throughout the Union. His actions must have a much happier tendency to promote the cause of religion, than those of our modern hypocrites, who, by profession and habiliments only, designate the character of a Christian.

When we reflect on the torrent of abuse, the deluge of calumny, which have flowed from his enemies ; when we consider, that every boundary of common decency has been overleaped, in vilifying his conduct ; when we contemplate the malicious disposition displayed in those papers which have been the receptacles of slander and defamation, what must we think of *the man* who can pass over in silence this unbounded detraction, and regardless of the enmity of his antagonists, urge the Legislative Body of the nation to devise ways and means to relieve the taxes of his fellow-citizens ? Human nature is peculiarly prone to retaliation for injuries. Mr. Jefferson seems exempt from this frailty—even his enemies, when reading the infamous publications in the Centinel, Palladium, and other factious papers, are constrained to say, that some governmental check ought to prevent such an intolerant spirit against the



chief magistrate ; but though *he* is the peculiar object of this disorganizing and jacobinical temper, yet far from returning “ railing for railing,” far from calling down the fire of legislative authority to consume his enemies, his conciliatory spirit may be described in the following language :

*Fellow-citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives* :—forgive my enemies ; I do not urge your “ blood to boil” against them ; I desire no sedition act to control their insolence ; my conduct is placed on the foundation of public scrutiny ; the republican system is fixed on the basis of universal investigation. Let my opponents say *what they please*—my actions are submitted to the enlightened judgment of my constituents ; to their opinion I am willing to appeal, and while acting in the executive department, I shall never descend to notice the scurrility of an expiring faction ; neither shall I screen myself within the barriers of a sedition law, to prevent a fair and impartial examination of my character and conduct. But, “ *fellow-citizens*,” I wave with pleasure all considerations of a personal nature. The subjects, to which I am desirous to draw your attention, are connected with public utility and general happiness. Thus predicated my administration on this foundation, let me ask you, whether the numerous *taxes* on our constituents cannot be lessened ? whether the excise and stamp duties cannot be dispensed with ? and whether the public debt (which, in *monarchical* countries, is considered a public blessing) cannot be discharged sooner than has heretofore been contemplated, and with more facility to the American citizens ? whether an expensive system of judiciary (created under the prospect of an immediate dissolution of legislative aristocracy) should not be annihilated, and this branch of government restored to its former simplified state ? that this last effort of a party, to *assimilate the American government to that of England*, should be defeated, and that the President should not, in the last hours of his political existence, organize a body of favourites, in a permanent station, to perpetuate his influence ?

This is the plain, intelligible language of the President’s message. While *entering into office*, does he shew the same temper of some, when *going out* ? Does he wish to extend his popularity by official patronage ? Is he desirous to create offices to aid his own energies ? Does he recommend those measures which might

lead thousands to court his friendship, in expectation of his lucrative disposals? If we had seen him active to originate a system, which would secure him the support of a formidable phalanx, we might doubt his sincerity; especially if we had seen him appoint men to office, in the most sacred connexion with those whom he had displaced, we should be jealous of his integrity. Nothing of this kind can be alleged against Mr. Jefferson; he stands before his fellow-citizens on the ground of republicanism, and, conscious of his uprightness, is ready to submit his actions to public and private scrutiny.

The government of a free people never assumed a more dignified attitude. While monarchies are constantly calling on the people for additional taxes—while a British budget (like Pandora's box) is fraught with evils, to be disseminated among the subjects, in the form of taxes and requisitions—while the ministry are straining to the utmost verge of extortion the small pittance in the hands of industry—while the exchequer is the common deposit of the hard earnings of the manufacturer and husbandman,—the *American republic*, under the wisdom and economy of its executive, is officially urged to retrench their expenses, and to lessen the burdens which for many years have distressed the citizens.

This country, from its first settlement, has been fated to the clamour and intrigues of a faction. The distressing system of finance, which has convulsed Britain, and rendered her government the mere vehicle to impoverish the *many* and enrich the *few*, was early adopted in the United States; excises, stamp duties, &c. have followed in quick succession; but, above all, a stupendous system of judiciary, which threatens to throw the life, liberty and property of the people, under the control of that unqualified instrument generally denominated the *common-law*, has been attempted. The judiciary of this country has already become too complex for the comprehension of the citizens; the late establishment enlarges the boundaries, and gives a scope to a *particular profession*, which must eventually grasp within its control the privileges and property of the whole community. This extensive machine, moving under the weight of a column of supernumerary judges, attended with the immense expense of their establishments, it is feared, would ultimately reduce the people to the most abject state of servitude. Lawyers would

generate in tenfold proportion to other professions, and, in time, this country would be as generally overrun by this "order," as Egypt with Mamelukes.

Notwithstanding the President has in his message given such a strong evidence of his attachment to the liberties and happiness of his country, yet the voice of calumny is still clamorous against him. But, fellow-citizens, has he injured you in his recommendations to relieve you from taxes? Are there any who wish for the continuance of excise, stamp duties, &c.? If there are, let them *speak*. If you want your internal manufactures burdened with duties, come forward and declare it. If you are desirous to continue the odious *stamp-act*, or wish to perpetuate the troublesome task of riding from town to town to buy a stamp-paper, to legalize your common negotiations, now is the time to gratify your desires by petitioning Congress to disregard the recommendations of the President. Ye who want to pay a tax on carriages (which probably convey your family to the house of worship), rally your forces, and send circular letters, to be read in churches, for joining in a remonstrance against the abolition of the duty.

If the citizens are enamoured with the late system of judiciary, and conceive themselves threatened with an annihilation of their liberties, in case it should be revoked, let them come forward with a declaration of the blessings they anticipate on the creation of a phalanx of judges, and the retinue of lawyers which follow in their train. This is placing the subject on its proper footing. As the President only desires to promote the public good, if he has mistaken the means, he will cheerfully renounce the measure. If the people say *taxes* are desirable, he will endeavour to gratify their wishes—but while he thinks the exigencies of government do not require their former latitude, he will use his influence to relieve and not burden them for the emolument of a few individuals.—He who is offended or injured by the President, let him speak! He shall be *heard* with attention, and *answered* with candour.

## No. LIII.

## THE BENEVOLENCE AND DIGNITY OF "THE PEOPLE."

THE sanguinary scene, of '*garments rolled in blood*,' having been so long and so often portrayed to the public, it must be peculiarly pleasing to the philanthropic mind to contemplate the restoration of peace, and the harmony of contending nations. Among five millions of republican citizens, it is possible that *one man* may be so destitute of humanity as to "pray for war," and thus erect his name as a monument of universal detestation. The olive branch is congenial to the feelings of *benevolence*, and though tyrants may realize advantages to themselves amidst the calamities of war, yet humanity will ever acquire an ascendancy when "the people" exercise their inherent virtues. Under particular impressions, the people may be deceived, and led into error, but their good sense will eventually extricate them from the evils designed by those who intended to impose upon them.

While considering the nature of government, some are too apt to suppose, that the magistrates of a *monarchy*, or an *aristocracy*, are exclusively inclined to favour the happiness of "the people"; they foolishly suppose, that the people are prone to evil, and generally disposed to violate every principle of social order. The reverse however is the fact, as the people are naturally desirous to substantiate their own prosperity; neither are they inclined to oppose government, provided it is administered with any tolerable degree of lenity. The Americans bore the oppressions of Britain, till they became insufferable; the citizens of France for centuries submitted to the tyranny of their monarchs, and impositions of their clergy, till the nation was nearly bankrupt by their extravagance and luxury; the poor, unhappy Irish have, for many ages, dragged the chains of servitude, while their task-masters are daily increasing their burdens, and wresting from the supplicating hand of wretchedness the scanty morsel allotted for its subsistence.

The subjects of one nation would live in continual amity with another, if they were not excited to a controversy by the ambitious jealousy of their rulers. For example, would the people of England have entered into a war with France, if they had not been stimulated by their king and ministry? Do we suppose that the soldiers, sailors and militia of England would have armed themselves against the French nation, if Pitt and his coadjutors had not promoted the warfare? No: France might have changed her government in quietude, and not one man within the combined nations would have felt the least inclination to interfere in the controversy. Do we suppose that a Dutchman, German or Englishman would have troubled himself about what was doing in France, if the emperor, stadtholder, and king of those nations had been tranquil on the occasion? An Englishman, Austrian, and Dutchman have no *natural* hostility to a Frenchman, unless provoked to animosity by those individuals who compose their *lords and masters*. Wars are not the operation of personal resentment between subjects of different nations and languages, but in most instances are created and fomented by men, who are benefitted by the contest, from the emoluments arising in their official capacity.

During the American revolution, the *benevolence* of the people of England was conspicuous on most occasions. Our prisoners were treated, *by them*, with the greatest hospitality. The *governmental prison-ships* were the bastiles of cruelty; but if an unfortunate American could take refuge among *the people*, he was sure of protection, and every display of humanity was exercised. The American people also, on the close of the war, received with cordiality the enemies of the revolution, permitted the refugees to return, and would to this day have embraced them with the utmost affection, had they not found that almost every old tory continued inimical to the prosperity of a *republican form of government*. As a further evidence of the *benevolence of the people*, I shall only observe, that our SAVIOUR would have fallen a sacrifice to the outrage of the rulers, *chief priests*, scribes and pharisees, much earlier than he did, had they not been checked in their progress from "a fear of the people." The people cried "hoshanna," and received him with the utmost cordiality, but the *mor-*

*archbical, aristocratical* and *priestly* authorities cried "crucify him ! crucify him !"

At the present day, we often hear "the people" depreciated, and the rulers exalted ; we hear the most degrading remarks on the *commonalty*, and the highest encomiums on the "well-born." But, if we examine history, we shall find, that war never arose between nations unless set on by the *monarchical, aristocratical, or clerical* part of the government.

To illustrate my remarks, let us reflect on the sudden return of friendship between Frenchmen and Englishmen. While the king and ministry were carrying on the war, the name of Bonaparte, and the fans culottes of France, were held in the utmost abhorrence in England ; the public mind was raised to such an elevation of resentment, against every thing which wore a Gallican appearance, that it was dangerous to list a sentiment in favour of the French in any public or private circle ; the theatres dared not to produce an exhibition that countenanced the revolution ; the First Consul was represented as the chief demon of Pandæmonium ; songs were composed to ridicule the Corsican usurper ; the French citizens were represented on the stage as a group of assassins or a band of desperadoes ; caricatures, expressive of the most degraded and ruinous state of the French government, were exposed in every picture-shop in London. But, as soon as peace was proclaimed between the two nations, "the people" exercised their *natural benevolence*, and rushed forth, like a torrent, to receive with open arms the messenger of this joyful intelligence ; the city of London re-founded with "long live Bonaparte ! long live the French nation !" The horses were dismissed from the carriage, as being too slow in their progress, and the people became the promulgators of the glad tidings, by conducting the herald to the metropolis, amidst the acclamations of thousands ; the city was illuminated ; joy was universally diffused ; the citizens congratulated each other with the warmest emotion, and there was not a gloomy mansion in the capital, excepting that of *Peter Porcupine*, the parasite of blood and conflagration. Here is an evidence of *benevolence*, arising from the people, which no man can controvert. The detestable wretch, who "prays for war," must be obliged, from this circumstance, to detest his own villanous imprecation.

From this statement of facts, I must ask the advocates for monarchy or aristocracy, what think YE of a government, in which "the people" have no control? Would not the people of England have been at peace long before this period, if they had not been prevented by their arbitrary rulers? Or rather, would they not have been *obliged* to prosecute the war, if the energies of Bonaparte had not arrested the further exertions of the English cabinet? Would not the swords of Englishmen have been still drawn to shed the blood of Frenchmen? and instead of fraternal embraces being mutually exchanged, would not the violence of resentment have urged each of them to spread the horrors of war in every city and village of the contending parties?

But, thanks to a benign Providence, the scene is changed. Instead of *conflagrations*, we behold *illuminations*. The SOLDIERS, instead of imbruing their hands in each other's blood, are clasping them together in brotherly affection; the SAILORS, instead of groaning under the cruelty of *impressments*, are rejoicing around the plenteous board of *refreshments*; the CITIZENS, instead of being alarmed at an hostile invasion, are hastening to the shores to welcome the harbinger of public security. The whole scene of peace assumes a pleasing reverse of war; every freeman's breast expands in transport at the beatific transition.

Thus far the representation of the *benevolence of the people* of England is exhibited;—but when we turn our eyes towards FRANCE, the scene glows with redoubled fervency. What more transporting and dignified spectacle can be exhibited than the FETE in Paris, on the termination of war? It is expressive of all the benevolent sensations of the human heart. Instead of a wild, ferocious effusion of ungovernable passions, (inflated by military successes) the whole arrangement evinces the most perfect system of refined reflection; every part of the transaction leads to social, moral, and political improvement:—"A temple, dedicated to CONCORD, is erected, in which hymns of peace and songs of joy are to be sung, accompanied with a full band of musicians, preceded by drums and trumpets. A pantomimic spectacle is to be given, in which *all the nations of the earth* are to be armed against each other, with a full picture of the calamities of war; on a sudden, these dreadful evils cease, and a serene light is shed upon the scene, while the TEMPLE OF PEACE is exhibited, accompanied

with the pleasing figures of the *fine Arts* and *Commerce* ; during this scientific and *dignified* repast, the TEMPLE OF COMMERCE arises, furrounded with a flotilla of boats, elegantly ornamented ; on board of which the *seamen of all nations* embark, while the Temple resounds with the flourish of a full band of music, in all the ecstasy of joy and conviviality. Each citizen is to illuminate his mansion ; the Thuilleries, bridges and quays are to be ornamented with trophies, expressive of the blessings of peace.”

What an exalted and *dignified* lesson of social happiness is inculcated by this festival ! Ye revilers of France, hide your heads in the dust, while calumniating a nation which even moralizes in her festive exhibitions. The boisterous huzzas in London may be calculated to express the feelings of Englishmen, but the refinement of France leads to a more exalted object, as connected with the cultivation of the human mind. *Dragging a coach* may gratify the *benevolent effusions* of a well-disposed London populace (depressed by the tyranny of their masters) ; but the citizens of France rise superior to such degrading servitude. Under the patronage of their government, they exhibit to the world the same *dignified* deportment in the celebration of peace, as they displayed in the prosecution of war. Every movement of the nation gives them an elevated position and respectable attitude ; if they were terrific in war, they are instructive in peace. Instead of exciting a vindictive temper against their enemies, or the world, their flotilla is filled with the citizens of *all nations*, and a universal peal of congratulation welcomes them to chaunt in chorus,

“ *Bless’d be the man, by Heaven design’d*

“ *To set the world from slavery free ;*

“ *In every age, in every clime,*

“ *His fame shall live in ecstasy.*”



## No. LIV.

## CHIEF PRIESTS AND "THE FARMER."

*"My Kingdom is not of this World."*

SCURRILITY and detraction have so long been the topics in the tory papers that it has become derogatory to the cause of republicanism to notice them, otherwise than by ridicule or satire. It is rather pleasing than mortifying, to observe the paltry efforts of an expiring faction, to recover their lost ground; and their struggles to regain that ascendancy, which had nearly brought our country into a state of ruin, are more diverting than alarming.

If a man was inclined to write a farce, he could not take a subject more appropriate to his purpose, than the ridiculous farrago which is constantly exhibited in the tory gazettes. On one side, we should find a "SULPICIOUS" roaring with the utmost vociferation, that the *whole body of clergy* were in danger of annihilation, and for no other reason, than because a writer over the signature of a "FARMER" had declared that *some* among the order had been more *outrageous* than *circumspect* in their political conduct.—Admitting that the Farmer has said this, yet it is a truth which cannot be controverted, and Sulpicius by making an uproar, will not persuade the people that the charge is erroneous. When we read this *clerical advocate*, we cannot but smile at his folly; he represents the priestly order as shaken to its centre—he calls upon the religious of all denominations to rally round *their standard*—he portrays eight hundred of them as falling martyrs in the cause of virtue and morality—we almost anticipate the faggots and fire of extermination, and our imagination is enlivened with the flames ascending towards heaven, while their expiring bodies are engulfed in the horrid conflagration.

To shew the folly of Sulpicius, suppose the writer of a farce should, in the first scene, represent him portending, in a phrenical

attitude, the ruin and destruction of the clergy—should describe on the stage, the tortures and persecutions of this respectable class of citizens, and close the act, with a descriptive scene of their agonizing dissolution. While this was exhibited, there is no doubt the audience would express the highest indignation at the cruel transaction; but, if in the next act, we should observe a large number of those individuals, who are thus exclaiming against persecution (with Sulpicius himself in the group) arrayed at the expense of their societies, in their gowns and canonicals, claiming *precedency* in the various circles in which they assemble, and seated around almost every festive board within their vicinity, partaking of the comforts of life in a superior degree to most of their parishioners, we should readily turn our detestation on the author of the calumny, and laugh at the folly of those who apprehended their annihilation.

We should readily inquire in what instance are the clergy persecuted? Did they ever live in more union with their parishioners? Were they ever better clothed and fed than at the present day? Is there one man of the clergy, who dreads the indignation of his parishioners in consequence of the remarks of the Farmer, provided he acts conformable to the duties of his office? While he continues in the line of his profession, there is no danger of disquietude—the people are willing to hear *gospel truths*, though they may be displeased with *political heresy*. If he so far violates his ordination-contract by preaching “*the doctrines of men*,” instead of the precepts of the gospel, he is no more entitled to pay from his parish, than if he totally abandoned his pulpit, and pursued a calling foreign from his engagements. If the parishioners pay three dollars a year to a printer for newspapers, they are unwilling to pay ten dollars a year to a parson for political disquisitions. A printer and a preacher are two distinct occupations, and while the people give the former a support in the line of his business, they are unwilling to double the expense to hear a repetition of the same subjects from the latter. When we read newspapers, we expect to find political controversies, and when we read or hear sermons we expect to find religious dissertations. When we see a sermon turned into a newspaper, it is as foreign from our expectations, as to see a newspaper turned into a sermon; every performance ought to be analagous to the profession of its

author. A printer to become preacher, or a preacher to become printer, is quite out of character. A *printer's devil*\* with his *smutty paper apron*, in the pulpit, would cut a singular figure, and a clergyman in his *lands*, besmeared with ink and beating the *black balls*, would be nearly as laughable a character.

The FARMER has considered the subject on this rational ground, and he is attacked with the utmost violence for this plain position. But who can contradict the assertion, that the duty of the clergy relates to spirituals, and is totally distinct from temporals. This is the doctrine of our SAVIOUR, who declared, "*My kingdom is not of this world.*" If the clergy are his ambassadors, they ought to be employed about "their Master's business." If "*His kingdom is not of this world,*" certainly his vicegerents cannot have a distinct kingdom from HIM, under whose commission they officiate. The whole doctrine of scripture expressly disowns every thing of a temporal nature. Revelation is founded on the declaration of the SUPREME BEING, that the powers of the earth shall not prevail against it. A real Christian increases in his faith, by the opposition made against the fiat of Omnipotence—the disciples and apostles never reprobated Pilate or the *chief priests*, because they were attempting to annihilate the Christian system by their persecution; on the contrary, they exulted at the idea, that every attempt to destroy its benign operation, would give celerity to the propagation. The martyrs at the stake never bewailed the decline of religion by their sacrifice, but, amidst all the torture and ridicule of their enemies, rejoiced in the pleasing hope, that "the gates of hell should not prevail against it."

If this was the faith of the disciples, apostles and martyrs, why does Sulpicius or any of the clergy appear so alarmed at the observations of the Farmer? This writer, so far from wishing to injure the clergy, only enjoins the same doctrines promulgated by our SAVIOUR and his apostles. When Christ was on earth the *chief priests* were the most powerful and vindictive body that opposed his ministry. At that time, these *priests* were interfering in political concerns. They were crying out—"he is not Cæsar's friend." They persecuted him in their ecclesiastical capacity,

---

\* *I beg pardon for the expression; but it is a technical term in the typographical profession.*

because they found he was destroying their political authority. Amidst this general outcry against HIM and his adherents, we find no distrust of the extermination of the Christian system ; but the commission was given, even in this " reign of terror," to go forth and *preach the gospel* to all nations. Christ's kingdom being not of this world, he rather promoted his cause by the opposition from civil rulers. Religion and civil policy were at variance, and the strength of religion was evidenced by not meddling with civil authority. Is it not strange then, that those of the present day, who profess to believe in the gospel, should be so constantly alarming the people, that religion is to be exterminated ? If they believe as they profess, these men must be ashamed of their conduct. Instead of being believers in, they may more properly be styled revilers of, the gospel. They doubt the authenticity of the declaration, " that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." They endeavour to gainsay what our SAVIOUR has expressly declared, that " his kingdom is not of this world." Instead of preaching politics, let them attend to Christian doctrines, and by that means put to silence their opponents.

Religion never gained a proselyte by a political argument. Propagating tales of illuminati, will never convert a man to the Christian faith ; it rather leads him to doubt its authenticity, when he is told that there is danger of its being subverted by a combination of renegadoes in Europe and America. If the clergy are alarmed, it naturally makes the people timid, for if the soldiers who are *specially commissioned* to " fight the good fight of faith," are discomfited, how can they expect to gain followers when the cause is considered desperate ? If the apostles had acted as *some* of our modern clergy do, they would have ruined in the first outset the whole system of revelation. Sulpicius appears more alarmed at the Farmer, than the disciples were at the anathemas of the whole Jewish hierarchy. He has only given *some* of them a gentle reproof, and by the subtlety of a *few delinquents*, they are attempting to bring into the controversy the whole order. The disciples, when commissioned to preach the gospel, were ordered to take neither money nor scrip ; but Sulpicius is rousing the clergy under an apprehension, that if they cannot *force* the people to pay them, the Christian religion will soon be obliterated. This temporal support was but a small consideration with the primitive

Christians, for St. Paul declares that if they looked for consolation in this world, "of all men they would be the most miserable."

Far be it from me to lessen their reputation, or take one cent from their decent maintenance. As a citizen, I wish to give them a proper estimation in the public mind ; but if a few clamorous individuals are endeavouring to raise them to an elevation above that which is contemplated by scripture, it is proper to consider this subject on the primary principles of the gospel. Our Saviour was born in a manger : he had not where to lay his head ; he was persecuted, and at last crucified in the most ignominious manner—his disciples followed his doctrines and experienced similar indignity. The Christian religion, however, prevailed against every opposition, and for the encouragement of saints, it will prevail till the consummation of all things. The "filthy lucre" of this world, is no way connected with gospel truths, and and when we see men roused to an improper resentment, on the suggestion of a decrease of pecuniary emoluments, we have reason to doubt the sincerity of their religious professions. Such men are the greatest enemies to the cause of real, unadulterated Christianity. It shows they pursue the profession merely for the emoluments arising from it, and not for the glory of God.

I acknowledge, however, that society requires every respect to the clergy, and I should be sorry to have them depreciated in public estimation. A large proportion of them are worthy the highest confidence, and I hope ever to see them maintained with a cheerful liberality. But, when we observe too great a stride taken to impose on the public by such writers as Sulpicius, &c. it is necessary to place the subject on its just basis, and if any *real Christian* contends the principles, he will be heard and answered with all that candour, which the importance of the controversy demands.

To conclude this discourse, I would briefly observe, it is my sincere belief, that the people of this country were never more disposed to pay every respect to the clergy, in the *line of their profession*, than at the present day ; and the only difficulty which has arisen, is solely owing to a *few* of the order, who, from bigotry, pride and ostentation, have busied themselves in those things which do not concern them, and thereby raised a jealousy which is

difficult to remove. If such fanatics would hold their peace, and mind their scriptural studies, instead of revising *Chesterfield*, and exciting false alarms, about combinations, massacres, &c. every difficulty would subside, and general harmony between ministers and people would be speedily restored.

---

## No. LV.

### OBSERVATIONS ON THE HON. G. MORRIS'S SPEECH UPON THE REPEAL OF THE JUDICIARY LAW.

WHEN declamation assumes the garb of argument, it is proper to expose the pageantry and exhibit the subject before the public in its proper habiliments. When a Senator *libels* THE PEOPLE, we cannot but smile at the tears he may shed, while bemoaning the annihilation of the Constitution. The people being the source of the Federal Constitution, an attempt to vitiate the principles of its vitality deserves the most pointed reprehension.

While reading Mr. Morris's speech, we cannot but pity the man who sacrifices propriety to sonorous periods, who vilifies that "popular will which brought him into political existence," and who deprecates "public opinion" as the quick-sand on which the Constitution is to be wrecked. He seems to take a stand above all legitimate control, and places himself and the "frail beings" around him, as the only barriers to maintain the dignity, harmony and existence of the American nation.

"THE PEOPLE" are held in the utmost state of degradation, and under this impression, he exclaims with superlative confidence, that, "we, we the Senate of the United States, are assembled here to save THE PEOPLE from their most *dangerous enemy* ; to save them from *themselves* ; to guard them against the baneful effects of *their own precipitation, their passions and misguided zeal* !"—A modest declaration truly ! Happy, thrice happy Americans ! how enviable your situation, that the *Hon. Gouverneur Morris, Esq.* and his "frail" associates should become the sole guardians of your happiness—on

what a permanent basis are your liberties, lives, and property founded !—With this ANCHOR ye can ride out the tempestuous storm of your passions ; ye can trust your treasures to their management, and “ throw your compass and charts into the ocean,” while the political ship is directed by their superior wisdom.—How sublime the benevolence ! that a man should wrest the weapon from the hands of “ THE PEOPLE,” which is uplifted to commit the fatal act of *suicide*. This virtuous Senator, like the angel of old, arrests the sword just ready to sever every endearing bond which unites the paternal and filial affections of society.—“ Do thyself no harm,” is the friendly voice of this guardian of our welfare—“ pause ! pause ! for heaven’s sake, pause !” is the fervent supplication of this disinterested and magnanimous patriot. Solicitous for our happiness, he proclaims the glad tidings, that “ WE, we the Senate of the United States, are assembled here to save the people from themselves” !!!—“ WE, we the Senate beseech you to have mercy on your lives, liberty and property ;” “ ’tis for this purpose that WE are chosen ; else why are WE elected for six years ; or why are WE chosen by *communities* while the Representatives are *chosen directly by the people*.” After this pathetic appeal, can “ The People” hesitate a moment to surrender every legislative transaction to the Senate ? Can they trust to *their Representatives who are only directly chosen by themselves* ? Can they be so foolish as to look for protection from men who receive no other commission than the *immediate suffrages* of their fellow-citizens ?

The voice thus calling on the people is rendered still more harmonious by a declaration of the strongest attachment to the Constitution. The sage and benevolent Senator, while imploring the people not to commit violence on themselves, declares that he has been “ twenty years their *servant*.” Although he has been “ a *servant*” upwards of two apprenticeships to this outrageous rabble, yet he now begins to vilify and abuse his *masters*. He denounces them as a pack of cut-throats, as committing outrages on *themselves*, and represents his *employers* as insane and dangerous to be trusted. This is an extraordinary story for “ a servant” to propagate about his master ; after being twenty years in their service, a better report might have been expected. It is rather singular to hear a “ *servant*” insult his *master* with such language—common decency

might have warranted a more mild reprehension, from one who assumes the courtly address of a gentleman.

How the Hon. Gouverneur Morris should have *more friendship* for the people, than they have for *themselves*; is a political paradox. The Constitution, in the preamble, conveys no such idea. It is there declared, "We, the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice," &c.—but, if Mr. Morris is right in his position, it ought to have run thus, "We the People, being disposed to injure ourselves, but having at this moment a short interval of reflection, do constitute and appoint the Hon. Gouverneur Morris and his "frail" associates, the guardians and protectors of our rights, liberty and property; and more especially to defend us *against ourselves*." If this had been the declaration, instead of being a *servant*, he would have been one of the *lord high protectors* of the people; he would then have had a commission properly authenticated to denounce the citizens; he could then with propriety have said "that he loved the Constitution—that he considered it the bond of our union—that on it depended our harmony and our peace—that without it we should be plunged into all the horrors of a civil war—that the country would be deluged with the blood of its inhabitants, and a brother's hand would be raised against the bosom of a brother." To be consistent, he cannot love a Constitution which is founded on the will of men whom he considers so frantic that "we, we the Senators" are obliged to save them from their most dangerous enemies, viz. *THEMSELVES*. Or does he conceive that after they had exhausted their *wisdom* in the mighty effort to create *him* a Senator, that they consequently exhibited their folly in laying a foundation to destroy themselves? The "servant" in this case becomes superior to his lord. How Mr. Morris acquired more attachment to the interest of the people than they have for themselves, is a singular phenomenon. In what instance has it appeared? Where is the document which gives him this pre-eminence? On what occasion was it evinced? Before a man assumes this elevated tone, it is necessary for him to produce the pledge of his supremacy—we doubt his premises, and it lies with him to substantiate his claim.

Besides, what part of the people does he presume to dictate? Does he charge the *whole body* as guilty of suicide? Are federal and anti-federal all in league to destroy themselves? It seems this



is his meaning, for he appears afraid to trust the House of Representatives even to amend the bill. This *senatorial protector* of our rights further declares, that "to *amend* the bill were to destroy it ;" "that even if it got back to the House of Representatives it would perish," and he is candid enough to declare that "we, we the Senate" "took the bill with all its imperfections."

In this state of the business, Mr. Morris, I am disposed to join you in your caution, of "pause ! pause ! for heaven's sake pause !" Let the people who are thus reprobated by you, seriously demand why you was afraid to trust the bill to the deliberate decision of the House of Representatives. Were not the respective branches of the Legislature composed at that time of a majority of those who are emphatically styled *federalists* ? Why was you at that time jealous, "if it got back to the House of Representatives it would perish ?" Was it of so dangerous a nature, that even the high-toned federalists of the "old school" viewed it with an unfriendly eye ? Could you not trust it in their hands, even for "an *amendment*" ? Was it of such a delicate texture, that to *amend* was to *destroy* ? Indeed, *honourable sir*, your rhapsodies transport you beyond your proper latitude—you carry too much sail for your ballast—you "throw the ship into the wind" by your superlative austerity, for while you level your attack on the people, you equally denounce the whole body of federalists who composed one branch of the Legislature ; you presumed to save THEM also from "*themselves*."

To bring this part of your speech to issue, I would inquire of the Hon. Gouverneur Morris, why he was afraid to trust the House of Representatives with a second consideration of the subject ? Were not a large proportion of the members high-toned federalists, friends to Mr. Adams, and opposed to Mr. Jefferson ? Did they not appear in their *night-caps* and *cockades* to counteract his election ? Why then, *honourable sir*, was you jealous that your favourite project would be defeated amid such a host of federal friends ? If they put on their *night-caps* and the still more formidable insignia of a *cockade*, to oppose Mr. Jefferson, it is probable they would have displayed equal fervor in support of the Judiciary system. Your declaration therefore, *honourable sir*, fully evinces the fallacy of your reasoning ; it proves that even the federalists in the House of

Representatives were unfriendly to the measure ; that the Judiciary act, if it was now before the same men who constituted the last House of Representatives, would be destroyed. In short, "WE, THE PEOPLE," desire no other evidence of the propriety of the REPEAL than this frank and explicit declaration of the Honourable Gouverneur Morris.

"Pause ! pause !" fellow-citizens, "for heaven's sake pause," before you trust your lives, liberties and property into the hands of men who declare you in a state of insanity. If the people are not competent to secure themselves, or if they are to look *solely* to the Honourable G. Morris and his "frail" associates for protection, the Lord have mercy upon them. If the people would destroy themselves, vain is their hope, if they look to him for resuscitation. I am free to declare, I had rather trust to the people than to him. The Honourable G. Morris may be a wise man, a prudent man, an honourable man, and a patriot ; but however wise, prudent and honourable he may be, yet I trust THE PEOPLE will never be in such a delirium as to look to him as the sole guardian of their constitutional rights. WE, "WE THE PEOPLE," are not disposed to commit suicide, and we must pause before we admit the idea, that the Senate are a body assembled to save us from our "*most dangerous enemy*," to save us from OURSELVES.

Other remarks on this Speech will occupy the next Number.

## No. LVI.

### HONOURABLE GOUVERNEUR MORRIS'S SPEECH.

WHEN a man weeps over the Constitution, it naturally excites a degree of complacency in the public mind to attend to his lamentations ; but after examining the cause of his complaints, and finding it the mere rhapsody of a heated imagination, we cannot but smile at the vehemence of his exclamation.

A stranger, upon reading Mr. Morris's speech, would naturally suppose that the fate of America was suspended on the continuance of this judiciary system ; he would think that upon its repeal, discord, anarchy and a state of nature would be the immediate result of the decision ; that government was dissolved ; that the Senate and House of Representatives were annihilated, and that nothing was to be expected but insurrections and every civil commotion.

This lively description might well be expected from Mr. Morris, who feels such a strong attachment to this particular branch of government ; who declares it to be the " fortress of the constitution " ; who, " like honest Ajax, would not only throw a shield before it, but would build around it a wall of brass." When a man steps forward in such a commanding attitude, with " his shield and wall of brass," we are ready to sympathize with him, should he fail to effect his magnanimous purpose.

But, honourable sir, let us be cool on this subject, let us throw aside all the parade of rhetoric, and appeal to the reason, rather than the passions of the people ; let us " pause," before we decide. After this deliberate reflection, I hope even the Honorable *Gouverneur Morris*, Esq. will wipe away his tears, soothe the emotions of his labouring mind, and so far compose himself as to lay aside his shield and remove his wall of brass, as useless and unnecessary.

Admit, honourable sir, that the repeal should take place, I would ask you, what difficulties would ensue ? Would the Constitution be annihilated by the repeal of a law, which you declared would not have passed, had it been returned to the House of Representatives for *amendments* ? According to your own statement, it was a crude, undigested system—it was a child of such distorted features, that you was obliged to watch it like a godfather, in its cradle—you was afraid to trust it out of your hands—you dandled it on your knees, and could not trust it to walk into another room, lest it should perish in its progress. Can any man be so foolish as to think, that a system so incomplete in its fabrication, so weak in its composition, and so abhorrent even to those who gave it existence, should be the " wall of brass," to secure the freedom, sovereignty and independence of our country ? This wonderful project was matured with precipitation, and organized at a moment, when the agents themselves were under the strongest parox-

isms of their own dissolution--this being a fact, how is it possible that the welfare, prosperity and happiness of the United States should be suspended on such a frail, incoherent and undigested system.

It is diverting to observe the pathos of Mr. Morris, when he exclaims, "if we lose *this charter*, never, never, shall we get another." I would inquire, honourable sir, what charter? Do you call this Judiciary act a CHARTER, which, if we lose, we "never, never" can renew? What mighty boon do we obtain by the adoption? What valuable acquirements are secured to the people by this hasty performance? Will a numerous body of judges, with all the expenses attending their appointment, be considered "a charter" so valuable, that if we lose it, the loss will be irreparable? The citizens, I believe, will never consider it so essential to their happiness, as to bemoan its annihilation; more especially, when they know, that by repealing this act, we are restored to the same system, under which government proceeded during the administration of Washington. By dismissing your phalanx of judges, we restore the old order of things, and if we were able to obtain justice under the benign administration of our first President, why do you presume to predict a dissolution of the Constitution, when we are desirous of giving the same energy to the Judiciary as was experienced under him?

"Away, away, with all these derogatory suppositions"; make yourself easy, honourable sir. If Washington was able to pursue the great purposes of government under the former system, is it not the highest presumption to suppose that it will not now answer? Even Mr. Adams had no other Judiciary than what is now proposed--neither could he need more. Were not the former judges fully competent to enforce the Sedition Law? Did he find in any one instance, that the judges were deficient in executing every federal mandate? Were not the courts of law prompt in their decisions to aid every measure which bore the feature of executive patronage? Did Judge Bee want any stimulus in the condemnation of Robbins? The judges under the former administration were preachers of the glad tidings of presidential infallibility, in every part of the Union. Produce, sir, one case, wherein the government was embarrassed from the delinquency of the judges? If the Judiciary were then adequate to all federal purposes, why

are they now deficient? If Mr. Adams could prosecute his measures under the old establishment, why are you to suppose that Mr. Jefferson is not equal to the same undertaking? Why should Mr. Adams on the night of his dissolution, wish to force on his successor a more extravagant Judiciary than he himself had maintained? Was it just, that Mr. Jefferson should be incumbered with supernumerary judges, and thereby bring his administration into disrepute, by an additional expense? Why should the wheels of government be clogged with a new system of judiciary, at the moment Mr. Jefferson was introduced into office? Why did Mr. Adams suppose, that his successor could not prosecute the business of the government with the same number of judges as were thought competent from the first establishment of the Constitution? It must rather appear officious in Mr. Adams to create a supernumerary body of judges, at the moment he was leaving his office, and when in all probability the business was decreasing. It is somewhat similar to a man's placing a number of tenants in a house after the expiration of his lease, and presuming to give them a *permanent* residence, without the advice or consent of the real owner.

Mr. Morris exhibits such an enthusiastic frenzy in this debate, that he appears rather like an infatuated preacher, than a deliberate Senator. The epithets are more expressive of fanaticism than reflection. In one instance, he represents himself in the strong muscular position of Ajax, throwing a shield to defend the Judiciary, and with Herculean vigour building a wall of brass around it: but after all his exertion in wielding his shield and building his wall, he declares, "he is *too weak* to defend the ramparts against the host of assailants." He however seems determined to pursue his enterprise, for if he fails in military ardour, or cannot embody men enough for personal conflict, he proposes to mount the ramparts, and with the utmost vociferation call to "his assistance the good sense, virtue and patriotism of his opponents." The honourable gentleman must have a sad task to perform in this situation—his shield thrown away, the ramparts of his brass wall totally defenceless, while this modern Ajax is mounted on the most prominent eminence, and like Patience on a monument, calling aloud to his assailants, "pause! pause! for heaven's sake pause!"—This is truly an unequal contest, and though we may think it a Quixotic

controversy, yet we cannot but applaud the heroism of the adventurer, even if we suppose the measure to be rash and precipitate.

The Hon. Mr. Morris appears however to bewail the constitutionality of the proceeding—on this part of the subject I shall offer a few remarks. It must be remembered that the Constitution is a *covenant of works*; every officer under it is assigned special duties and services. Officers are not contemplated unless services are attached to them. Neither the legislative nor the executive can wantonly create offices, unless there are special duties to be performed. The pay goes with the *services*, and if none is to be done, there is no pay stipulated.

To apply this reasoning to the new Judiciary system. If the last administration in order to effect certain purposes took upon themselves to annihilate the old order of things, and in a precipitate manner created a new system, with a number of supernumerary judges, totally unnecessary for the circumstances of the country, can it be doubted, whether it is in the power of the present administration to rectify the measure? The only question is, whether the former Judiciary system was competent to the purposes as it related to the number of judges; if it was, has the executive or legislative a constitutional authority to burden the people with an unnecessary expense, or can it be considered unconstitutional to repeal an act, or refuse payment to judges, when no adequate reason can be offered for the extension of the system? It is readily granted that a Judiciary shall be established; this was done at the earliest period of the constitution. The question then is, whether there can be no *limitation* in this establishment? Whether a legislature just expiring, and a President just going out of office, shall combine to make twenty judges, when five are fully sufficient for all the exigences of our government? Whether it can be unconstitutional to relieve the people from unnecessary taxes, when it is apparent that the establishment was rather a sinecure to the judges. Though the Constitution says, that, “the judges shall hold their offices during good behaviour,” yet it also says, that they shall receive for their “*services* a compensation.” The Constitution contemplates *services*; and if none is performed, it is out of the power of the legislative to grant them any pay. The Constitution meets

the opposers more forcibly in granting compensation to judges whose "*services*" are not required, than in the annihilation of the office. It being a *covenant of works*, the duties of the officers are essentially connected with their salaries. It would be a violation of the Constitution to grant compensation to a mere *nominal judge*, when it is expressly declared, that he must perform "*services*" before he is entitled to his pecuniary consideration.

Upon the whole, the honourable gentleman has mistaken the *spirit* and even the letter of the Constitution, when he enforces the unconstitutionality of *not paying* the judges; for nothing is more plain than that "*services*" must be performed, before one penny can be drawn from the public treasury. If so, I would inquire what *services* the present judges have *done*, and if in the opinion of the legislature there are none for them *to do*, whether by the *spirit of the Constitution* they are entitled to any compensation? This appears clear reasoning, for if the legislature can grant pay to a body of *nominal judges* when their duties are not required, or, if it is out of their power to modify the courts so as to retrench, if necessary, the number of judges, it is nothing more than an indirect method to create within the United States a formidable phalanx of pensioners in direct opposition to every rational and economical principle of the constitution. The organization of the Judiciary being invested in Congress, it follows that the system must ever be within their cognizance. Infallibility cannot be supposed more attached to the legislature in this instance, than in many others which are subject to revival. The constitutionality of the repeal therefore is evident by the absurdity of their being bound to adhere to a system, inexpedient from our situation, adopted without mature consideration, in opposition to the will of the House of Representatives at the time of passing the act, and from whence no essential "*services*" can be rendered to the United States.

## No. LVII.

TO HARRISON G. OTIS, ESQ.

A PUBLIC avowal of political principles is a strong proof of the integrity of a man's conduct. As you, sir, often retail political sentiments in a caucus, and vaunt in your adroitness in stimulating a party, on the evening immediately preceding an election, it cannot be thought improper to compliment such an orator, by requesting a copy of his speech for the press.

As you, sir, have such serious objections to the administration of the federal government, it is a pity that such cogent reasons should not have a more extensive circulation than within the small circle of a few devoted friends; or that Vila's tavern should be the only theatre on which to display the magnitude of your patriotism and the immensity of your political talents.

On Friday evening last, a numerous body of citizens assembled at Faneuil-Hall, to select proper candidates for Governour, Lieutenant-Governour and Senators. The republicans were called on; the friends to UNION were invited. If, sir, you had any thing to allege against the present administration, it was incumbent on you to meet your opposers on equal ground; if you had attended, you would have heard a request to men of your sentiments, in the presence of two thousand citizens, to offer their observations. But so far from any person on your side of the question confronting their opponents, they declined the controversy.

If, sir, you was sincere in your remarks on sabbath evening, at Vila's, why did you not appear on Friday evening at Faneuil-Hall? Why did you choose to confine your observations within so small a compass, when you had an opportunity to give them a more extensive circulation? If the present administration has a tendency to produce the evils you suggested, it was your duty, (as an honest man) to give publicity to your apprehensions. If the northern states are to be injured by Mr. Jefferson, proclaim



the reasons of your belief in such a manner, and in such assemblies, as may lead to an impartial investigation of this interesting subject. Do not vilify a government without giving an opportunity of replying to your charges.

The design of your speech seems calculated to raise a jealousy between the northern and southern states; to destroy the confidence of the people in the friendly disposition of the present administration; and to inflame the public to such a pitch as to dissolve the union. If such were your intentions, let me ask whether you have weighed in your mind the consequences of such measures, as they relate to the various interests of the merchant, tradesmen, and the holders of the public funds?

The merchant must eventually be injured by such a separation—the tradesman would immediately feel the distressing effects of this mercantile embarrassment—and the holders of the funds would experience a shock which would shake their quarterly payment to the center.

If the northern and southern states should separate, a *new constitution* must be adopted by the New-England states. The high-wrought principles of the Essex Junto would be universally exploded, and though some might think to impose on the northern states a constitution analogous to the British, yet a convention of delegates, acting under the instructions of their constituents, would baffle their expectations. During the important period of adopting a new constitution, the public debt would be suspended between the contending parties, and the creditors would be hawking their 6 and 8 per cents. about our streets (like the old soldiers) at 2/6 in the pound.

These remarks are not visionary, but are too serious to be sported with. Who then will thank the man that has agitated a subject so uncertain in its consequences? Will he be considered as a friend to the general interest who attempts to rend asunder the bands of UNION, set afloat every species of property, and thereby force the public creditors to seek an asylum amid the contending parties? These are questions of importance, and ought at least to check the sallies of disappointed ambition, lest the evils should thicken too rapidly to be easily dissipated.

In order, sir, to bring this subject to a fair investigation, and to try your arguments by a touchstone more pungent than the effusions of Vila's hall, you are again requested to publish your philippic against the federal government, delivered on sabbath evening, and I pledge myself to answer it, with a signature equally as explicit as the one you subscribe.

## No. LVIII.

TO HARRISON G. OTIS, ESQ.

THE Boston Gazette of the 5th instant, contains a few sketches of your speech delivered at Vila's on the sabbath evening preceding the election for Governour. It is declared, "that you have always acquitted yourself handsomely, but never did better than on this occasion." We have then, sir, before us, one of your *best speeches*, and though the reporter apologizes for his inability to do you justice, yet he cannot forbear gratifying those who could not be indulged the pleasure of seeing and hearing you acquit yourself so "*handsomely*."

The speech abounds with such an energy of pathos, that it excites a glow of fervency in the first outset. We cannot but admire the brilliant sentiment in describing Vila's hall as a *camp*, in which was collected the main body of the federal army. Bonaparte could not address his veterans in a style more heroic than you did the *moderator*, viz. "Hard indeed, sir, is the fate of a garri-son, when the troops are not only obliged to *sleep* upon their arms, but find it necessary to make frequent sallies to prevent a *surprize*." If your troops were disposed to meet their opponents, why do you complain of a "*surprize*," when on the Friday evening previous to your *muster*, the republicans gave public notice that they were to assemble at Faneuil-Hall? Certainly, sir, there was no danger of a "*surprize*," when you had notice in the public papers three days before your meeting. Why did you not then *sally* to the Hall, and like a *bold general*, bring your men into the

field of battle ? Why, on that evening, did you suffer the garrison “to sleep on their arms,” or why did you choose to desert the ample space of Faneuil-Hall, and crowd your *main body* on a *sabbath evening* within the small compass of Vila’s hall ? Is it generous, sir, to complain of a “surprize,” when the most public information was given of the *time* and *place* of meeting ? If your troops have long “slept on their arms,” why did you not rouse them from their *slumbers*, and march them in solid columns to confront their opponents ? I suspect, sir, the difficulty in your garrison arose principally from the want of *ammunition*, and that you thought a few volleys of musketry, when the republican army was dispersed, would have a better effect than a general engagement.

Your speech, sir, further describes, in pathetic language, “the inconveniences which the aged and *sober* citizens sustained on an election-day, by the noise and confusion of the *jacobin bawlers*, on Faneuil-Hall stairs.” Why is this charge against the *jacobins* (or in other words the republicans) when your own caucus appointed a committee of one hundred and twenty men to distribute votes on this occasion ? If you look over the names you will find among the number, some of the most noisy, boisterous men that can be produced in the town. This committee arranged themselves in similar order, in conducting the election, as the firewards make lanes to communicate water to the engines. The whole force of the federal party took possession of almost every avenue, and every voter had to pass an ordeal, under the minute inspection of bank directors, Essex junto men, and sycophants hanging on their patronage. How then, sir, can you presume to talk about “jacobin bawlers,” when the caucus, in which you assumed the direction, appointed such <sup>a</sup> numerous committee, as almost drowned by their vociferation every articulation of the republicans ? Why then, sir, do you talk about the “*engines* of reason,” to extinguish the “*furnace* of your opponents,” when you yourself blew the bellows of opposition, and voted for one hundred and twenty men from Vila’s, to influence the election ?

Your reflections on the choice of Mr. Jefferson are unworthy notice. I do not, sir, close with you on this ground, by admitting that your objections are valid ; but if you persist in your caucus declamations, I am willing to meet you on this question, whenever your warm zeal shall lead you publicly to support your objections.

The foregoing observations are solely confined to the rhodomontade of your speech, as it relates to the sublime fiction of an army assembled in Vila's hall, the "jacobin bawlers" on Faneuil-hall stairs, and the indecency of your assertions as to the election of Mr. Jefferson. I shall now advert to your ridiculous pathos, on the measures of the present administration. From a "garrison," Vila's hall is suddenly changed to a boisterous ocean—the wreck of the constitution is described as floating on every billow, "our judiciary on one wave, our internal taxes on another, and our late standing army on another." You further say, that "not only the doors but the windows of the temple of justice have been burst open, and the building is filled with a banditti; the pillars of the temple are broken down, its roof has fallen in, and its foundation is undermined." What a deluge of ideas crowd upon the mind amid such an inundation of rhapsody. In a hot room, thronged with a body of heated federalists, how must such glowing sentiments operate among them? Waves and billows engulfing the constitution—internal taxes bobbing up and down like drowning kittens—the standing army, like wharf-rats in a high tide, quitting their encampment—the judiciary! the judiciary, though represented by you as a *temple*, is nevertheless described as floating on a wave; the windows broken, the doors burst open, and a banditti thronging the building. If, sir, the old administration have launched such a *solid temple* on the ocean, and filled it, like the *Trojan horse*, with a banditti, it is rather miraculous to find it floating on a wave! I should suppose it would sink to the bottom, and that "its foundation" would not easily be "undermined."

I am sensible, sir, that it is necessary here to notice an apology which appeared in the Palladium; but in justice to your friend who reported your speech in the Gazette, I cannot think it possible for him to be guilty of such an error. It is probable, that such a gross mistake should arise from a man who pretended to give a sketch of the *best speech you ever delivered*; that the "right of suffrage" should be mistaken for the *judiciary system*;—that he should absurdly describe the "doors, windows, benches," &c. of the "*right of suffrage*." No man in his senses could make such a blunder, and yet the editors of the Gazette endeavour to palm, through the Palladium, such absurdities on the public. They

took care not to expose their folly in their own paper, and therefore made the Palladium a "cat's paw" for the purpose.

In this controversy, sir, nothing more is required than the truth ; if your friends have not done you justice, assume the right to yourself ; let us have the *whole speech*. If the waves of faction are swallowing up the constitution—if the pieces are tossed about on every billow—if the temple of justice is filled with a banditti, and their *honours* are exposed to *catch cold*, by the windows being broken, and every door burst in, let us have the dreadful disasters described in plain language, and it is not doubted but every republican will lend a hand to repair the damage.

It is equally as *mortifying* to me particularly to address *you* on this subject, as it may be *condescending* in you to reply to my observations ; but the crisis of political controversy is such, that it is proper to bring individuals, who volunteer themselves in opposition to the present administration, to explain the motives of their conduct. The object of my address is to prevent an improper bias at the moment of an election, and if possible to bring the leaders of the federal party to an explicit avowal of their sentiments, before the tribunal of the public. The republicans are willing to submit their cause to an impartial investigation, and as you, sir, have presumed to take the lead in opposition to them, your silence will be considered as an evidence of the imbecility of the cause you espouse.

## No. LIX.

### ON THE MEASURES OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION.

*What evil have they done ?*

THE political controversy in this country is unparalleled in the history of the world ; a government assailed by the intrigues of a faction who have no other pretence for their conduct, than the attempts of the administration to lessen the taxes of the people, is a singular phenomenon in society. This peculiar mode of creating animosity among the citizens, is reserved for a wonderful event

of the present day ; it is a political paradox, and must excite the admiration of Europe, as a circumstance of a peculiar nature.

The calumny daily bestowed upon the executive and a majority of the legislature, naturally calls upon the citizens to inquire, *What evil have they done ?* Why are such constant alarms excited ? Why are the papers so fraught with abuse and detraction against every man who appears desirous to support the present government ? Why is a party calling on the people to rally ? Why are they urging a separation of the states, and endeavouring by every means to destroy our *confidence* in the executive ?

*What evil have they done ?* is a question which still recurs. Where is the man who is injured by the measures of government ? Is the *merchant, tradesman or farmer* injured by the *decrease of taxes* ? Even the *stock-holder* has no reason to complain, as his quarterly demands are as punctually discharged as when the government *borrowed money at 8 per cent.*

Is it possible then, that there can be a serious disposition in the people, to oppose the present administration ? If no man is injured, who is to begin the opposition ? If no citizen is aggrieved, who is to rise in arms, and under what standard are we to rally ? An army in the field, with all their military apparatus, in opposition to a government which is *relieving them from taxes*, must be as ridiculous as the vagaries of Don Quixote. It is possible, however, that some *knights-errant* may contemplate such a whimsical crusade, and some Sancho Panza stand ready to attend him in his enterprise ; but the good sense of the people must ever hold such wild extravagances in the utmost detestation.

President Jefferson, since his inauguration into office, has by a system of *economy*, saved the United States upwards of *three millions of dollars* ; and yet, strange to relate, has been abused in the most outrageous manner, for the very measures which effected it ! Instead of which, had he made an addition of this sum to the expenses of the last administration, his present calumniators would have been his warmest advocates ; for it must be remembered, that his opponents are of the “ sect,” who hold the doctrine that “ *a public debt is a public blessing* ;” consequently, every dollar expended is a pledge of that *blessing*, and every shilling saved is the foreboding of a *national curse*. If the President, instead of repealing our internal taxes, had augmented them—instead of discharg-

ing a numerous body of useless officers, had increased them—instead of paying the stockholders with the duties arising from import only, had requested a loan of millions, at 8 or 10 per cent. interest: If he had done these things, the federal papers would have been crowded with congratulations on our national prosperity; addresses would have covered the presidential table, and in all probability we should have been called on to revive the *cockade*, as the emblem of our attachment to his administration.

But, alas, it happens unfortunately for this class of gentry, that Mr. Jefferson explodes the sentiment that “a public debt is a public blessing”; he does not wish to place the happiness of his country on this foundation; this “*modern philosophy*” he disowns; he studies the general welfare of his fellow-citizens; and is not desirous to heap blessings on one class of men, by *curfing every other with taxes*.

This, fellow-citizens, is the *evil which he hath done*—he has lessened the burden from the shoulders of his constituents, and has pledged himself that he will pursue this line of conduct to the extinguishment of the public debt. These are his crimes, and these are the sins of the present administration—if any man is *injured* let him speak.

Here, methinks, I hear a number of men exclaim, *he has turned us out of office*. Alas, gentlemen, your cases may be deplorable as to your particular private interest; but you must console yourselves, that the President is not to act by *partial*, but by *general* laws. If you have had the good fortune for many years to live by your offices, it does not follow, that you should continue in them, if the exigencies of the country do not require it. It may be a very “*pretty thing*” for you, to receive an annual compensation arising from the public taxes, but it would be a grievous thing to those who *pay them*, if your services are no longer needed. If you enjoyed these blessings for a number of years past, you ought rather to congratulate yourselves that you have been so far benefitted, than to censure and condemn the government for not continuing you in office. The citizens are *grateful*, but not *prodigal*—we *thank you* for all the good you have done since your appointments, but you must excuse us, if we are willing that the *pay* should stop, when your labours are wholly useless.—Though some of you are displaced, and others take your births, yet modesty should forbid you to exclaim against the President; for if he was strictly to

“lay justice to the line and righteousness to the plummet” he would extend his removals to a much greater length ; for why should those, opposed to his administration, enjoy his particular patronage ?

The scurrility against the President is so gross, and the causes of complaint are so absurd, that I conceive it necessary to apologize for seriously noticing them. The federal party appear determined to place the United States in the most derogatory point of view in the eyes of the European nations. While other powers are laying exorbitant taxes on their subjects—while England is burdening the people at the risk of an insurrection, the Essex junto are endeavouring to raise a rebellion in America for *lessening taxes*. What can be the design of this measure ? The reason is obvious, they wish to convince the world, that “THE PEOPLE” are never satisfied ; that there is as much opposition in the *republic* of America, for *decreasing taxes*, as there is in the *monarchy* of Europe for *increasing* them. This faction are endeavouring to confound all governments ; to riot on the earnings of the industrious, and if any complaint should arise to bring America as the voucher to prove, that *The People* are never easy. Their plans are deep and subtle ; they are rallying to overthrow the liberties of mankind, and every stratagem is used to effect their diabolical purposes. They wish to prove, that the “*people are their greatest enemies.*”

To prove my position, I would remark, that there is no more opposition to the British ministry for *augmenting taxes*, than there is in America for *lessening them* ; the English papers are not more severe against the British government, under the pressure of taxes, than the federal papers against the American government for the extinguishment of them. Would it not then be a strange story in history, if the people of England should rise in arms to obtain an *decrease of taxes*, and the citizens of America should at the same time rally to *increase them* ? It would be a curious chapter of accidents, for a recruiting sergeant in the city of London, to beat up for volunteers to seek a *relief from taxes*—while in Boston, one should, with equal ardour, hold out the tempting inducement of an *additional weight*. This is a paradox ; but the “modern philosophy” that “*a national debt is a national blessing,*” is the only hypothesis on which such an absurdity can be substantiated in this country.



The Essex faction are not contented to lay heavy taxes upon us, but they are anxious for a *division* of the Northern and Southern States. If this should take place, what would be *our* situation? The shipping of the Northern States must lay at the wharves, and British vessels would enjoy the exclusive privilege of the *Carrying-Trade*; our ship-carpenters would speedily be obliged to lay by their tools; and every tradesman in town, connected with navigation, must retire into the country, or become an underling in the store of a British agent; our *young men* would be cut off from every commercial enterprize, and have the mortification of seeing British ships unloading British manufactures in the Northern States, and from thence sent to the Southward for a freight of tobacco and other valuable produce.

Let us then, fellow-citizens, look around us, and inquire, *whether an enemy is not doing this?* Who are the men that are urging a separation, and censuring the present administration? Tell me, whether among the whole number, there is an old tory who is not concerned in this business? They pretend to call it *federalism*, but the truth is, it is *toryism in disguise*; it is the poison of the *old leaven*, which threatened to “leaven the whole lump,” during our revolution. The enemies of that day, used every effort to make us jealous of our patriots; Hancock and Adams were then abused similar to Mr. Jefferson—our Congress were stigmatized as a banditti—the temple of justice was then described as having “every window broke and every door burst in”—the “friends to order” were then called on to rouse from their slumbers, and on the night of the 19th April, 1775, (when the unsuspecting citizens had retired to rest) they sallied out on the defenceless yeomanry, and ere the sun had risen to its meridian, embued their hands in the blood of our slaughtered countrymen. At that time they endeavoured to divide the Northern and Southern States—but “*UNITE OR DIE*” was then our motto, and it is now as strong a pledge of our safety, under the guidance of heaven, as the ark, amidst the deluge of the old world. Let us, then, fellow-citizens, be collected, be firm, and persevering—rely on the goodness of your cause and the rectitude of your conduct—depend on it, heaven will never suffer us to fall a prey to our enemies, after

so many miracles wrought in our favour, during the distressing period of our revolution.

## No. LX.

### ARTS AND DELUSIONS.

#### *A Demand! a Demand!!*

IT must be acknowledged that the *junto* have one valuable trait in their political character, viz. *to make the most of every event which arises in their favour*. In this particular, they adopt the peculiar policy of the British ministry, during their controversy with France; every success obtained by the English (however insignificant) was detailed in the government gazettes, as victories of the highest magnitude; the people were led to believe, that every measure of the nation was fraught with the most happy consequences, by partial statements of the defeats and disasters of their enemies. The tower-guns were often fired to announce victories of the most brilliant nature, when the cabinet at St. James's were in possession of documents of a very different complexion. The spirit and enterprize of the nation were essential to the great object of their contention; it has always been the invariable system of the English, to make the most formidable appearance, when their affairs were in the most desperate situation.

During the American war, this conduct was pursued with alacrity; the English papers were constantly filled with anticipations of a complete conquest of the colonies, and the capture of Burgoyne was precursor'd with the vanquishment of the American army; Bunker-Hill battle was celebrated as the most glorious display of British heroism, and the possession of that eminence was described as commanding the most extensive fortresses of America.

During the French revolution, how often have we heard of the total disaffection of the French army? Bonaparte has suffered as many deaths, as Mary Magdalene had devils; he has been

assassinated, eaten, furnished, drowned, frozen, poisoned, blown up, and burnt in his camp; the Mamelukes and crocodiles of Egypt have alternately triumphed over his carcase; and the *unfortunate* Bonaparte has sometimes been buried in the sands, and at other times devoured by wild beasts and birds of prey, for the amusement of ministerial hirelings, and to deceive and gull the people.

Thus have the British pursued a system of delusion, and have by these means urged the nation to prosecute their chimerical projects, till even falsehood had lost its energies.

The Essex junto in this country have adopted measures, similar in almost all instances with those of their adherents in Europe; every stratagem has been practised, every mode of deception has been prosecuted; plots and conspiracies were daily announced, as "*clues*" to more disastrous discoveries. As fast as one falsehood was discovered, another was immediately circulated; our elections were ever attended with fresh details of alarming apprehensions, and the people have at these periods, been excited to exercise their suffrages under impressions, that a "tab-plot" was about to blow up the continent, or that a body of *Illuminati* were undermining every church in the Union: *some of the clergy* seemed to apprehend that a *Guy Faux* was secreted in every avenue leading to the places of public worship. These idle tales at length began to grow too stale for belief, and their effects were lost among the body of enlightened citizens. True, however, to their designs, the junto persisted in their plans to rouse the fears of the citizens; having exhausted their ingenuity to create new stories of "Ocean massacres," &c. they at length rallied their whole force, and concentrated all their efforts in the cry of a "*French demand!*" This was their *ne plus ultra*; this was their master-piece of policy; here they supposed they had touched the manly spirit of the Americans; a *demand! a demand!* was echoed and re-echoed through the Union—a *demand! a demand!* was proclaimed in every city, town and village within the northern states—a *demand! a demand!* flew like electricity throughout Massachusetts; and on the day of election, though the tremor had somewhat subsided within the circle of information, yet the agitation of the public mind had not totally evaporated; like a shock of an earthquake, it left an undulating motion, which gave an opportunity to the projectors of

the report, to effect in an extensive degree, the pernicious purposes contemplated. Since these disturbers of our peace have been detected in this diabolical scheme, they have given it a more favourable appellation; they have modestly called it a "*loan*," which wears quite a different aspect than what they endeavoured to impress on the public mind by "*a demand, with twelve sail of the line to enforce it!*"

This story, however, turned out a falsehood in every particular, as the French, so far from *demanding a loan*, (with a threat of twelve sail to carry it into execution) have not even *requested* a cent from our government. Thus falls to the ground the "*mammoth*" plot of a "*French demand*." Baffled in every circumstance on this subject, they are obliged to cover their deformities, by saying that "*they intended to request a loan*." This, however, is a miserable apology for the hue and cry of a "*demand*," and the terrors of twelve sail of the line to enforce it. If they *intended* to make this request, happy are we that the *proceeds* of the man, who "*prayed for war*," has *intimidated* them from their requisition.

The Essex junto, after being defeated in all their designs, have at length resumed courage by the election in Boston. They now run about the streets in frantic ecstasies, assemble on the Exchange with a majestic deportment, and collect at corners in an hostile attitude, for the purpose of vociferating with Stentorian lungs, that *federalism* is gaining an ascendancy in the respective States; as an evidence of which, their first declaration announced that Colonel Thomas was not chosen in New-York; but in two days the Editor of the Centinel was obliged to contradict the falsehood in his own paper, by informing the good people that this same Colonel Thomas obtained upwards of nine hundred votes majority. In this effort they were soon frustrated, and there remains but one solitary resort, viz. *the election in the metropolis*.

But the fallacy of this expectation will soon be realized. The idea that the people of Boston have changed their political sentiments, is also fallacious; the votes, either as it respects Governour, Senators or Representatives, are no test of federal principles, as the confusion and disorder which arose on the first election by the throng passing to the boxes, gave an oppor-

tunity for those who were disposed to violate the equal suffrages of the citizens, to put their plans into execution. The tumult was so outrageous, that it was *out of the power of the selectmen* to prevent an improper crowding upon them, and it is publicly asserted by a respectable tradesman, that he saw three men put a handful of votes into the box, during the general scramble. The last election was more orderly prosecuted, the selectmen have ever shewn a disposition to accommodate the citizens, but the difficulty which attends voting, and the time which it takes to be regularly checked, prevented a large proportion of the republican tradesmen from coming forward on the election of Representatives. The choice, therefore, in this town is more owing to *accident* than any *real change* of political sentiment among the inhabitants. If any specific question was brought before the town, relating to the present administration, there is no doubt the junior would be left in the minority. They are always fearful of a public investigation of Mr. Jefferson's conduct, and choose to confine their caucuses within a small room, rather than to appear in the ample space of Faneuil-Hall.

Notwithstanding all these evidences of the problematical state of the town, yet now, forsooth, the Representatives of Boston are going to raise the "setting sun of federalism." The cry is, we have this *great man*, and that *great man* in the Legislature; and that the seat last year was not *honourably* filled, we had no talents, no honesty, and that one hundred thousand dollars tax was laid on the town by the inefficacy of the members; but this year we shall have *honourable men*, all *honourable men*, gentlemen of veracity; and above all, we are to be *honoured* with a *SPEAKER* from Boston. Thus every thing is planned with the utmost accuracy for the adoption of the Legislature. Now federalism is reviving, and the country members are under a forcible direction from the "head-quarters of good principles;" if there are any opposers it is probable they will be called a "contemptible minority"; the "*honourable men*" will set their faces against them, and like Joshua of old will arrest the *setting sun* of federalism.

Here I would pause and inquire what is the real meaning of *federalism*, in opposition to the administration of Mr. Jefferson? Does federalism consist in an extravagant expenditure of public money? a standing army? an 8 per cent. loan? a continuance of

internal taxes, whereby Massachusetts paid eighty thousand dollars, and Virginia only forty thousand dollars ? a supernumerary body of officers to create presidential patronage, and whose pay exhausted a large proportion of the income ? Is it federalism to calumniate the President, abate every officer of government, vilify the majority of Congress, raise the resentment of the French, and court the smiles of the English ? to encourage thousands of British residents to monopolize the trade with England, and to starve our young American citizens, to feed those who scarcely pay a shilling tax, while they are vending the same articles imported by our own merchants ? If this is federalism, it is impossible that it should long prosper--the YOUNG MEN will quickly feel the effects of this policy. If this is federalism--if this is the "rising sun" which is vauntingly proclaimed as diffusing its benign efficacy, depend on it, my young friends, that its genial warmth will never promote your happiness ; it will baffle your hopes ; your enterprize will be frustrated ; the cultivation of the soil will not extend your growth ; the harvest will redound to Britons, while you will be left in the field of commerce, like vegetables blasted by an untimely frost.

## No. LXL.

### TO THE "YOUNG MAN," IN THE PALLADIUM.

I HAVE READ your performance with considerable attention, and am sorry you have discovered so great a degree of acrimony in your observations.--Truth is of such a delicate texture, that it must be sought for in the calm recesses of reflection, rather than in the turbulent effusions of the passions. The ornament of a young man is *modesty*, and when he overleaps the boundary of decency, he exposes himself more to pity than respectful attention. If you have any objections to my remarks, it would be more becoming to point out the impropriety of them, than to retort in a language which conveys an idea that your *manners* have not been improved by your *education* ; presuming, however, that you have ven-

tured in public in order to obtain information, and being unwilling to disappoint you in your laudable design, I shall wave, for the present, my own reflections, *on the baneful tendency of British factors enjoying the same commercial benefits with our own citizens*, and recommend to your candid perusal the circular letter, written by some of our most respectable mercantile characters in the year 1785.

This letter has often been published, but as it contains facts of the most interesting nature ; as it expresses the sentiments of men who are well acquainted with our commercial relations ; as the measures recommended were the basis on which our federal government was founded ; as the debates in the several state conventions (during its adoption) principally contemplated the necessity of some "checks and balances," on the European trade : For these reasons, I presume it will not be thought improper at this time to recommend this important document to your consideration, or even to recommend its being read annually in our town-meetings. It is so particularly descriptive of the present state of our country, I flatter myself, while it communicates *to you* that knowledge of which you appear at present so destitute, it will serve to revive those sentiments among the citizens at large which actuated the merchants of Boston at that eventful period.

However, "*young man*," if the letter should fail to convince you of your error, I shall only request that your resentment will hereafter be levelled on the gentlemen who disseminated these principles by a circular letter, (even if some of them have apostatized) rather than on one who is only a proselyte to the truths which it contains.

When you arrive at the age of maturity, you will know the difference between those industrious emigrants, who arrive in America for the purpose of improving our manufactures, cultivating the soil, and whose object is a *permanent residence*, and the mere transient hawkers who only reside in the commercial towns, for the sole purpose of vending their goods, to the injury of our merchants, who pay little or no taxes, whose residence is so temporary, that they are not afraid to hazard their reputation by erroneous entries in the custom-house, and who will in time destroy all the regular importation of our own citizens.

If the *young men* of the present day are more enlightened and liberal than the merchants whose signatures accompany the Ad-

drefs, or if they are persuaded they can rise superior to all the consequences anticipated by those gentlemen, yet I am persuaded there is so much candor residing in the breasts of the youth of this metropolis, that they will not consider me as "their enemy," though I may be thought too officious in warning them of the danger contemplated by some of the most distinguished patriots at that alarming crisis.

If the young American, with his wife and family, feel disposed to have a Scotch factor or an English agent enjoy equal commercial advantages with themselves, it is a misfortune for which I am not answerable, or think that the man who deprecates the tendency arising from such evils is "their enemy," I must submit to the implication; but let me assure such inconsiderate revilers, that the time will soon arrive when they will *feel* the effects of their folly, and be *obliged* to acknowledge the man who forewarns them of the evil as their *best friend*.

## NO. LXII.

### THE POLITICAL PHENOMENON.

THE present state of politics in this country, must exhibit the United States as a phenomenon in the view of European nations. To observe individuals in a republican society contending against those vital principles, on which its legitimate permanency must exist---to read publications fraught with the most malignant calumny against the man who is desirous to substantiate the full energy of those doctrines, which have ever been considered as the bulwark of a free government---to see papers which are styled *federal*, prostituted to the base purpose of dissolving the Union!---to find toasts circulated around the festive board, tending to excite the most abhorrent passions, and countenanced by clerical characters, who profess to inculcate the benign maxim of "peace on earth and good will towards men"—to hear the full-toned organ (dedicated to hymns of praise and thanksgiving to the



great Ruler of the universe) leading in discordant notes to the sanguinary song of blood and carnage among the citizens of the respective States ! Instead of the angel of peace, to portray “ the amputating knife,” in the temple of Him, who declared, that “ whosoever drew the sword should perish by the sword !” To notice the hypocrisy of those, who, while they pretend to eulogize Washington, are destroying the great *Legacy of Union*, which he bequeathed at the last moments of his existence ! To observe the base intrigues of men, who by falsehood and deception mislead the honest yeomanry and tradesmen of Massachusetts, New-Hampshire, and Connecticut, to counteract the principles so earnestly recommended by this departed patriot ! When, fellow-citizens, we view these things *systematically* pursued, have we not reason to pause and examine the characters who are doing the mischief ?

In the first place, if we look through the town of Boston, can we find one man who was opposed to the revolution, but what is a reviler of President Jefferson ? Or, is there one man among them, who was inimical to Washington, during the war, but what is now in opposition to Jefferson ?—These men treated Washington, during our revolution, in the same manner they now do Jefferson. Did they not represent *him* as the leader of an intolerant faction ? Was not his conciliatory conduct treated with every indignity ?—Were not his attempts to relieve us from *internal British taxes*, considered as infringing on the prerogative of King, Lords, and Commons ?—Was not his opposition to the establishment of a Judiciary, the judges of which were to remain *permanent under the pay of the crown*, denounced by the then British faction, as a *violation of the Constitution* ? Was not the declaration of independence, though sanctioned by the signature of Hancock and enforced by the sword of Washington, called the “ speaking trumpet of rebellion” ? Were we not then called upon, in the same tone of energy which now designates a Morris or a Bayard, to “ pause, for heaven’s sake pause” ? Were not the patriots of Congress denounced as a body of insurgents, and were not the American army destined to the gibbet, in case their prowess had not been equal to the great objects of our Independence ?

If we had not succeeded, Samuel Adams, John Hancock, George Washington and a host of heroes would have been handed down in the American history, in the same degrading point of view, as President Jefferson now stands in those papers devoted to a junto, who from the beginning were unfriendly to every republican character within the United States ; and should any *prominent* character, in the time of the revolution, be now countenanced by this party, it would be only in *proportion to his apostacy* from the great cause which brought him from obscurity, and gave him a political reputation. In every instance, the Essex junto have supported the *old revolutionary patriots* so far, and no farther than they have renounced their republican creed. Though a man might at those days oppose a feudal system, yet if he is now in favour of an hereditary president and senate, they will receive him into full communion.

The present controversy is not merely an opposition to Mr. Jefferson, it is no more nor less than the outrageous effusions of the enemies of our revolution, against republicanism ; they may sweeten the pill with federalism, to make it palatable, but depend on it the most component parts are the poisonous ingredients of *toryism*. These people find that the President is reverting to original principles ; they are anxious therefore to rally under false colours ; they cry out *Washington*, and, like Judas, would salute him "hail, master, and kiss him," but, at the same time, would if in their power, crucify him and every man who professes to be his disciple.

The tories always spoke one language—they do not argue, but declaim ; they do not reason, but denounce ; they do not attempt to convince, but alarm. They declared in 1775 that we had broken the Constitution ; that destruction would follow our opposition to Britain ; that we ought to pay taxes ; that it was proper to have a standing army ; that a numerous body of officers, to live on the earnings of the people, were congenial with liberty ; that a republican government was a volcano, which generated in its bosom the lava of its dissolution. They attempted to dissolve the union of the States, by shutting up the port of Boston, and giving exclusive privileges to the other sea-ports ; they spread alarms among the people, and kept the continent in

one constant state of perturbation ; they told us that Adams and Hancock were traitors, and that a permanent judiciary, paid by the crown, was the only basis of English liberty.

Is it not necessary then, fellow-citizens, to examine the designs of these men ? Why is calumny heaped on the present administration ? Why is disunion advocated as the desideratum of public happiness ? Why is the President treated with such pointed disrespect ? Are you distressed by being relieved from taxes ? Is the repeal of the excise on distilled spirits injurious, when on the commencement of this tax, Governour Strong and Mr. Dalton, Senators from this State, were opposed to the measure ? If we now say the repeal is unjustifiable, we condemn Governour Strong, as he was, from the first introduction of this act, in the opposition. Can it be disadvantageous to our citizens, when we paid 80,000 dollars, and Virginia only 40,000 ? Can it be beneficial for us to continue a tax which took twenty dollars out of every hundred to support the various officers for collecting it, and which amounted to 180,000 yearly ; every cent of which is saved to the people by abolishing the system ? Every other part of the internal taxes fell largely on the New-England States, and yet the tory faction are attempting to renew the system, under the deceptive plea, that we are to be benefitted by the measure.

The judiciary is another source of complaint against the President. But is there a man in the United States who wishes to extend this department of our government ? Where is the man who candidly thinks that the bench and the bar, (though respectable as men) have not already their full preponderancy of weight in the community ? Ye who attend our courts, and ye who have causes depending, examine the records and your own bills of cost, and then answer whether the liberties and happiness of America depend on an extension of judiciary prerogative ? The man who has a disposition to abuse the present administration, for this timely check of professional influence, must have been peculiarly fortunate in not being obliged to pass the ordeal of a law-suit, otherwise the evidence would have been too forcible on his mind and purse to admit a doubt as to the propriety of the repeal. To illustrate this remark, let the will of Washington speak ; as he therein declares, that all controversies as they related to *his estate*, should “ be decided by three impartial and disinterest-

ed men." This is the deliberate voice of HIM in whom "*all hearts united.*" Who then can controvert the principle? Who then can vilify HONESTUS?

Have ye, fellow-citizens, gone to your homes, after attending a Circuit or District Court, and bewailed the weakness and imbecility of the judiciary, as it relates to any one officer within the whole department? If it is true that the happiness of our country wholly depends on giving further energy to the judiciary, in the name of liberty and independence, let us rally round this neglected and enfeebled part of our government—let us anathematize the President and Congress—let us commence a crusade to Washington-City, and under the banners of the judiciary, to the tune of "*Rule New-England,*" let us entrench ourselves within pistol-shot of the Legislative and Executive—thus embodied and embattled, let us send in the articles of capitulation, and peremptorily demand an unequivocal compliance with our wishes!

To shew the unreasonableness of the attack on President Jefferson's conduct, let us suppose that he had been at the head of the administration the last four years; that the public debt had increased, though the revenue had been so abundantly productive from the European war; that he had raised an army evidently unnecessary at the period of its establishment; that he had burdened the citizens with excises, stamp duties, and a direct tax; that he had borrowed money at the unprecedented interest of 3 per cent. Suppose he had pursued a system of expenditure upon a scale similar to the above items, in most of his transactions—should we not consider it a happy event, if Mr. Adams had been chosen and in a few months had adopted measures exactly conformable to the present administration? Would not the people have thought it was a change for the better? Would they not have reason to be thankful, that the finances of government were adequate to all our purposes, while they felt themselves relieved from such a number of burthenome taxes? This is a fair statement of the question, and if the Essex Junto deny it, let them state their objections.

Why then, fellow-citizens, is all this rancorous temper excited? How degrading must we appear in Europe, to find us abusing the man, whose whole conduct appears directed to the public good! It is impossible, that the real friends to our country are the

authors of that calumny which daily appears in our papers—they must be enemies, lurking in our sea-ports and interior, men who are baffled in their designs to establish themselves and families on the ruin of our general prosperity. Let us be collected, cool and deliberate, and by *persevering* in the glorious cause of republicanism, we must obtain the victory; we shall “rise conquerors, yea more than conquerors,” over the disturbers of our national quietude—we shall finally triumphantly sing,

“*Columbians never, never shall be slaves!*”

## No. LXIII.

## “STEADY HABITS.”

IN all controversies, either religious or political, the parties generally adopt some laconic terms, which give celerity and facility in prosecuting their favourite tenets. *Orthodoxy* has had a wonderful effect in theological disputes; for who can be opposed to *orthodoxy*? Who can be an enemy to the *true faith*? The Calvinist claims this appellation; the Socinian enlists under this banner; the Universalist pleads *orthodoxy* as the ground-work of his profession; and even the *Shaker* exclaims, “*orthodoxy! orthodoxy!*”—Thus, in religion, we are oftentimes led by sounds, without attending to realities. Controversies have oftener originated from attachment to *names*, than from spiritual improvement and information; abuse and scurrility are frequently the weapons of opposition, and the purity of the subject is commonly lost in the impurity of the language.

Calumny never made a proselyte, though it generates hypocrites; a man who seeks popularity by sacrificing principle, may accommodate himself to a leading party, but he who has no other monitor than his own conscience, views with the utmost indifference the frowns of his enemies, and observes with ineffable contempt the base designs to injure his reputation. The whole history of the bible is fraught with similar sentiment, and when those who

pretend to profess doctrines contained in that holy record, calumniate as *orators* and defame as *politicians*, so far from substantiating their belief in what they profess, are, (like the hypocrites emphatically described in that sacred volume) "*whitened sepulchres*," which "within are full of all manner of uncleanness." If a man inculcates the doctrine of our Saviour, "blessed are the peace-makers," yet if he violates the injunction by his practice, the sincerity of his faith becomes doubtful.

In politics, as in religion, certain terms are used to accomplish particular purposes. "*Steady habits*," in Connecticut, have been a significant appellation to designate the different classes of citizens in their political sentiments. When we hear a man in that state, abusing the President, calumniating the administration, degrading every officer in the government, deprecating the repeal of internal taxes, and condemning the restoration of the judiciary system, he generally concludes his outrageous observations with this emphatical declaration, that *he* is a friend to "*steady habits* !" He will in the most wanton manner vilify the character of his neighbour, who differs from him ; violate all the benign attributes of candour and charity ; and after anathematizing his opponents as the most abject beings in society, he closes his illiberal remarks with an ejaculation to heaven, to *preserve Connecticut in its "steady habits* !" he praises God that he is not a *Jeffersonian republican*, and that *Connecticut* is not like *Virginia*.

How a man can apply the "*steady habits of Connecticut*," in vindication of his abuse to the present administration, is a mystery too intricate to be explained. That state, in all its governmental proceedings, pursues a system the most analogous to Mr. Jefferson's of any in the Union, and yet, wonderful to relate, are opposing his measures, under the false idea that he is infringing on *their "steady habits*." The expenses of their government are brought within the narrowest point of parsimony ; their elections are more frequent than in any other state ; their judges are chosen annually ; the salaries of their respective officers are provident to a proverb ; the people are industrious, and "earn their bread by the sweat of their brow." Notwithstanding which, such has been the infatuation of many honest, well-disposed persons, (owing to the deception practised by the junto, in league with a few over-heated clergymen) that the very "*habits*" of that respectable state are brought

as proofs of the impropriety of the present measures of government.

Why should Connecticut be singled out in opposition to Mr. Jefferson? If we analyse his conduct, it exactly corresponds with the economical "steady habits" of that State. He has lessened public taxes—he has reduced the number of supernumerary officers—he has brought the public expenditures within the revenue arising from *impost*—he has placed our finances on such a basis, that an 8 per cent. loan, it is probable, will never again be required—a land-tax cannot be expected to arise under his administration—he has RESTORED the judiciary to the same state in which Washington left it, and has carefully avoided burdening the citizens with taxes for the support of unnecessary judges. Is it possible, then, that a real difficulty should exist in Connecticut, when every measure so completely quadrates with their own scale of internal policy? The yeomanry must be deceived, if they suppose the former expensive system was more calculated for their interest and prosperity. I would venture to appeal to every farmer, whether the economy of the present, or the extravagance of the last administration, is most congenial to his wishes.

The landed interest is deeply connected with economy; other branches may struggle under a weight of taxes, but the farmer must eventually fall a sacrifice, if his earnings are taken to support an administration founded on the "innovating" principle, that "a public debt is a public blessing." A public debt is no doubt a *private blessing*, by providing for a clan of lazy, idle sycophants; but the folly of an opposite doctrine must be evident to men, who, from "habit," have become "steady" in preserving among themselves the principles of industry and economy.

It is rather laughable that the "steady habits" of CONNECTICUT should become appropriate to extravagant federal measures—a Connecticut farmer in favour of a land-tax!—a Connecticut manufacturer an advocate for excises!—a Connecticut merchant a proselyte for stamp duties!—a Connecticut Christian deploring the repeal of a duty on his chaise, which conveys him and his family to the house of worship!—a Connecticut citizen lamenting that an eight per cent. loan is not necessary for the expenses of government!! These *strange absurdities*, however, have been the test of federalism. A Connecticut clergyman, who prays for a

connexion between Church and State, may anathematize those who have declared such "*innovations*" unnecessary ; or a body of lawyers may anticipate a decrease of business, in consequence of opposite measures ; but it is *impossible*, that the great body of citizens should consider as *grievance* a contrary line of procedure, unless the grossest deceptions have been practised on their credulity.

Can it be supposed, that Connecticut citizens will approve of a JUDICIARY, which claims a control *over the Legislature*, when they are so cautious of this branch of government as to choose their judges annually ? Can they be in favour of a LAND-TAX, when their whole interest lies in this species of property ? Will they be in favour of an EXCISE, when their grain furnishes such a supply for distillery ? Can they approve of the "*innovation*" of an EIGHT PER CENT. LOAN, when all their transactions are within the old established usage of *six per cent.* ? Or can the people confide in the integrity of a *few* federal clergymen, when they see an Huntington sacrifice every vestige of decency, and christian benevolence, in calumniating a clerical brother, merely for political purposes ? "Such things are," but common sense forbids their continuance. It may answer for "half a time," but it cannot be durable, when information dispels the clouds of error and deception. The fact is, the citizens of the most republican States, have been led to support federal measures, not from *conviction*, but from *deception*. The honesty of the people has been practised on by an artful, intriguing, priestly junto. Not that I do, or ever did, suppose that the clergy in *general* were opposed to republicanism, yet I believe, that the *subtlety of a few* has in many instances deceived many of the very elect. Owing to an uncommon exertion of the federal party, the good people of Connecticut have been *forced* to adopt sentiments contrary to every "*steady habit*" imbibed by themselves, and predecessors. They have been deceived by some spiritual leader, to embrace political doctrines subversive of all those legitimate practices, which have raised them to their present opulence, freedom, and respectability. A system of administration prosecuted on the same extravagant principles with the last, would have proved ruinous to every agricultural State in the Union. A standing army—a numerous body of excise men—a burdensome judiciary, with all the connexions attendant on a particular profession, might be advantageous to those who live by



the labour of others, or to those who profit by litigious law-suits; but in a country, whose prosperity depends on agriculture, commerce and manufactures, all such extraneous contingencies must prove destructive to the permanent happiness of the people.

From the first settlement of America, ECONOMY and INDUSTRY were the "JACHIN and BOAZ" of the Northern States. In every Legislature, we find that the purse-strings were held with peculiar circumspection. In Massachusetts, the treasury department is watched with hawk-eyed attention. Rhode-Island, Connecticut, and New-Hampshire, have their "steady habits" in guarding against the inroads of extravagance. All money matters are considered with the utmost accuracy; they not only *weigh the gold* issuing from the treasury, but also *weigh the measures* which draw it from the place of deposit. An extravagant system could never become popular in either of the Northern States. If any man ever took *New-England ground*, it is Mr. Jefferson, and it only shews the folly of the federalists to expect to raise a formidable opposition to him from this quarter. He conforms his measures to our "habits;" he pursues such a mode of conduct as must be universally approved; it is impossible he should fail of success, as he takes all our rules for his guidance and direction. Would a governor in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode-Island, or New-Hampshire become unpopular by reducing taxes? Should we have thought, if a British governor had imposed heavy duties before the revolution, that an American governor, by reducing them, was an enemy to our national happiness? If, under Hutchinson, we had a stamp-act, surely under Hancock we experienced the efficacy of the repeal. These reflections are consonant to our "steady habits;" they are the test of "New-England feelings, manners, and principles;" under no other regimen will "New-England rule" or be ruled; they are the tenets of legitimate orthodoxy; all other doctrines are heresy, "*innovation*," "modern philosophy," and political "atheism;" it is the new-fangled creed of the Essex junto, propagated by missionaries under the immediate patronage of their disciples; it is promulgated by false prophets, aided by a few ignorant, supercilious priests; commissioned by a junto, who are planning the ruin of the country,

an alliance with Britain, a war with France, and the dissolution of the Union !

*Fellow-citizens !*—This controversy is plain to every man's understanding, and nothing is wanting to restore universal harmony, but to read and judge for yourselves. Have your burdens increased since the inauguration of Mr. Jefferson ? Has not your public credit risen to an uncommon elevation since that period ? Wherein then is the difficulty ? I will tell you—a few men, who have anticipated the exclusive benefits of the federal government, by posts of honour and profit ; who, under the last administration, had a prospect of aggrandizing themselves and families, at the expense of the public ; such men, and their connexions, are disappointed, by lessening the sources of their promotion, and the principal clamour arises from them. Common sense dictates to us, that no real opposition can, or ever will arise among “ THE PEOPLE,” while their government is administered on the principles of economy ; *they* never will contend for a land-tax, a stamp-act, a standing-army, or for a numerous corps of excisemen ; *they* will not quarrel for supernumerary judges, or for the increase of the influence of the bar. The advocates for such measures may cry aloud, but “ THE PEOPLE” will turn a deaf ear to all their acclamations ; their “ steady habits” can never be deranged by such “ *innovating*” projects. We may rest assured, that a New-England-man never will exchange his plough for a musket, to enforce additional taxes ; such an absurdity has never yet been practised among us, and I trust never will.

## No. LXIV. .

## THE CHURCH IN DANGER !!

*“ SHOULD the infidel JEFFERSON be elected to the Presidency, the seal of death is that moment set on our holy Religion, our churches will be prostrated, and some infamous prostitute, under the title of the Goddess of Reason, will preside in the Sanctuaries now devoted to the Most High.”*

New-England Palladium.

*“ THIS unholy spirit of Atheism has already deteriorated the political and moral condition of this country, and still menaces our hopes, privileges and possessions.”*

Mr. Emerson's 4th of July Oration.

THE public mind has been so long “deteriorated” by alarms and apprehensions, that it is proper to arrest the attention of the citizens, to a candid reflection upon the above paragraphs. In a society, composed of men influenced by the precepts of religion, it is natural to suppose, when the cause of *christianity* is threatened with annihilation, that every serious member will be roused in its vindication. No wonder the federalists built their expectations on Connecticut and the Northern States ; for if the election of Mr. JEFFERSON was to “seal with death our religion, prostrate our churches, and some infamous prostitute was to preside in the sanctuaries devoted to the Most High,” it was full time for every religious “sect” to put on the whole armour “both of faith and practice.” This is a high charge against the President, but like all other effusions of fanaticism, it falls by the pressure of its own weight.

*Fellow-citizens*—Let us for a moment *condescend* to reason with these men, who thus deprecated the election of Mr. Jefferson. He has been elected nearly eighteen months, and I would ask them

in what instance has "*the seal of death been set on our holy religion*" ? In what city, town, or parish, has "*the church been prostrated*" ? In what state has "*an infamous prostitute presided in the sanctuaries of the Most High*" ? The *pious* Palladium said these things would take place at "*the moment Mr. Jefferson was elected,*" and yet he has been President nearly eighteen months and not one particular has turned out in conformity to its prediction !

The federalists have of late become so insignificant in their observations, and expose themselves so grossly by their absurdities, that they are scarcely worthy a serious reply ; for my own part, they are not viewed as antagonists ; they are become rather the sport of satire, than the subjects of argument. The controversy is so unequal, that it is rather condescension that excites in me the common civility of refutation ;—would a man, who values his reputation, presume to argue with those, who so often expose themselves to ridicule ?

The pith and marrow of the whole federal "*sest*" are consolidated to the terrific charge, that Mr. Jefferson's election will endanger religion. This dreadful prediction, is proclaimed through the *consecrated* medium of the New-England Palladium. This infallible oracle receives an additional influence, by being edited by a Connecticut genius, who lately displayed his scientific knowledge, by inserting a receipt to make a *whortle-berry* (vulgarly called *buckle-berry*,) PUDDING ? While he is thus anxious for a *good pudding*, we cannot but suppose he will be equally attentive to the moral virtues. When, therefore, it is declared, in a paper which travels by the bounty of federal charity into the mansion of almost every clergyman in New-England, that if Mr. Jefferson is chosen President, the churches will be prostrated, and that some hag will preside in the sanctuaries of the Most High, can we wonder that a temporary infatuation has bewildered the well-disposed citizens, and that a faction of old Tories, should have excited a transient disgust against *the man* who penned that *declaration* which severed America from the fangs of Britain ?

I have endeavoured, fellow-citizens, to treat every subject with deliberate consideration ; but you must excuse me if I indulge a *humorous* excursion on the present occasion. Pray, *pious* editor, from whence did your distressing forebodings arise ? who were the pioneers, armed with weapons of destruction, to level the churches ?

who were the *notaries*, to set the seal of death on our holy religion? who were the artificers, to fashion out the image of the Goddess of Reason, and who were the banditti to erect it in the temple of the Most High? The absurdity of your declaration is evidenced by these inquiries, and yet you have solemnly told the citizens, that "*at the moment*" Mr. Jefferson was chosen, these evils would take place! Can you suppose that the people are so ignorant as to credit your absurdities? Has there been any attempt to accomplish your prophecies? What church is threatened with prostration? What reverend prelate is under bonds or imprisonment? Is any subordinate member of the church suffering persecution? Are not your clergy as well paid now as when Mr. Adams was President? Has any society lowered their annual salary? Are the reverend pastors called on to do more duty than formerly? or has the "*arduous work of the ministry*" increased? Have we heard of any "*innovations*" to lessen the income of the church? If these things have not taken place, what can be the meaning of the pious Palladium in denouncing the people as subverters of order and religion? Since the settlement of this country, the clergy never *lived easier* than at the present day. It is ungenerous then to be abusing the people as atheists, deists, and disorganizers, when their whole conduct proves the fallacy of such epithets.

So far from churches being "*prostrated*," new ones are daily erecting; proposals for building meeting-houses are more frequent in our newspapers than formerly. In Boston we shall soon see the *New-North* rise more glorious than the former temple; if we prostrate an *old church*, it is to raise a more splendid *new one* in its place. Since Mr. Jefferson's election, we find religion is as highly rated as ever; *some* societies are *liberal in procuring pastors*, while others are as tenacious in estimating them at their *full value*; even the old-fashioned pride is banished, of crowding all *respectable families* in the broad-aisle and on the lower floor, and *gallery pews* are now sought for with the greatest avidity. In short, every thing about the churches looks as flourishing since the election of Mr. Jefferson as before; instead of beholding "*an infamous prostitute*" presiding in our sanctuaries, they were never more ornamented with *LADIES*, comely in their attire, and attractive in their deportment.

These things being facts, is it not surprising that a man from Connecticut should make a declaration so contrary to truth ? that he should raise a false alarm, and put the whole Christian church into consternation ? Or, how can any man, clothed in sacerdotal, seriously assert, that "*atheism* is deteriorating the moral and religious condition of this country," when every appearance carries such strong conviction to the contrary, and when he knows there is not one *professed atheist* on the continent ? How can we reconcile these declarations, when the revival of religion is so powerful (stated in the Evangelical Magazine) as to "*knock down*" by the terror of the law, thousands of men, women and children ? How are we menaced with an annihilation of all morality, when "*whole forests are illuminated with lamps*" to guide the heavenly pilgrims to the place of worship ? When men thus impose on the public, it is but justice to the cause of virtue and religion to notice their absurdities, to expose their folly, and hold them up as objects of derision.

A trifling parade of assumed consequence ; a pedantic display of classical erudition, interspersed with a few vitiated pronunciations of the American dialect, may give a person a vast idea of his own importance ; but men of cool reflection easily discover the gauze covering, which screens such pretenders from the public eye.

It is worthy of observation, that every prediction of the federalists has proved false, as it related to Mr. Jefferson's election. They not only told us that religion was to be banished from our country, but that the public credit would be sacrificed, and that commerce would be wholly unprotected. Instead of which, *religion* has risen to an uncommon elevation, if the accounts of the Missionary Societies can be credited ; the *public stocks* are higher than for many years, and our remaining ships of war have protected our Mediterranean trade, even beyond what they did when their numbers were much larger.

*Fellow-citizens !*—Be no longer deceived ; assume your wonted position ; let not fanaticism on one side, and apathy on the other, lead you from your duty ; act like *men* in deliberation, and like *brethren* in decision ; your enemies are few, though violent in their opposition ; they buzz like a disturbed hive, but their clamours must eventually cease. *They* want an expensive government, and

the question is simply this, *Are the People in favour of taxes*, when they are not needed? Let the question be taken throughout the Northern States—YEA OR NAY—*Ye who are in favour of heavy taxes, please to manifest it?* If the tories want to know the public opinion on this subject, let them try it in town-meeting, or even at Vila's caucus.

## No. LXV.

## THE WORLD TURNED UPSIDE DOWN ! !

*“Those men, who have turned the world upside down, have come hither also.”*

**I**S it *possible*, that the christian dispensation should raise a formidable opposition from men who pretended to disown all worldly grandeur and emoluments, and who lived in expectation of a reward in another world? But however paradoxical it may appear, yet the only antagonists which gave our Saviour or his disciples any trouble, were those who professed the greatest concern for religion, and who lived within the purlieus of the altar. The whole history of the christian system is a narrative of the scandalous treatment of the chief priests, scribes, and Pharisees, towards its professors. They were followed by a body of persecutors, who were constantly exciting the public resentment against them. The enemies of our Saviour prosecuted their plans with such insidious art, as even to gain over, by *bribery*, one of his disciples, to betray him. He was early pursued by Church and State: for Herod began his sanguinary purposes by murdering the infants in Bethlehem. When that failed of the object contemplated, Satan, immediately upon his baptism, in a courteous strain of adulation, *tempted* him. After the powers of earth and hell had exhausted all their stratagems to ensnare and destroy him, he began his mission by preaching on the mount, and from that *eminence* made a

solemn declaration of the benign principles of his mission ; he recommended his ministration by acts of kindness and beneficence ; healing all manner of diseases, and evidencing his divinity by signs and miracles, which gave a lustre to the philanthropy of his character. Is it *possible*, then, that any opposition could arise against a system which displayed such complacency in its Author ? Should we expect to find among his opponents, those who professed to study the happiness of mankind, or seemed devoted to the cause of virtue and religion ? But the history informs us, “ that when the chief priests, scribes and Pharisees saw the things which he did, they were displeased, and from that time sought to lay hands on him ; but they feared the people.” The Pharisees also took counsel “ how they might entangle him in his talk.” They began their artifice by questioning him, whether it was lawful to give *tribute* to CÆSAR ? They were preparing to entrap him that he was not *Cæsar’s friend* ; but our Saviour, though thus surrounded by a *junto*, boldly began his opposition, by denouncing them as hypocrites and deceivers. The Sadducees next came forward, “ who say, there is no resurrection ;” thus combining *Church and State*, as it related to taxes to Cæsar, and the final retribution of mankind. The *money-changers*, it is probable, were greatly disturbed in consequence of being “ whipped out of the temple ;” they therefore allied themselves with the Sadducees, in order to form a *federal connexion* with this powerful “ sect.” The Pharisees seemed greatly alarmed, when they found he had put the Sadducees to silence, and they gathered together and deputed a *lawyer* to ask him a question, for the purpose of *tempting* him.

After he had confounded this *last tempter*, (from “ the bar,”) no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man, from that day forth, ask him any more questions. As soon, therefore, as our Saviour had defeated the scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, chief priests, Satan, and the lawyer, he began to speak to *the people* and his disciples. He appears, at this period of his ministration, convinced of the opposition which he was to encounter, and therefore began his mission by warning them of the deceptive arts of those who had long deceived them under the mask of hypocrisy. Matthew, in his 23d chapter, (which I recommend to my readers to peruse) begins his narrative in a most triumphant manner : after describing the complete victory of our Saviour over his



antagonists, he goes on, "Then spake he to the *multitude* (which shews that he did not consider "*the people*" as "wolves," or *themselves* as their "worst enemies") saying, the scribes and Pharisees set in Moses' seat, but do not *ye* after *their* works; for they *say*, and *do not*; they bind heavy burdens, and lay them on men's shoulders, but they *themselves* will not move them with one of their fingers; they love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogue, and greetings in the market place, and to be called of men, Rabbi, rabbi." After describing these persons in their proper characters, he goes on for 39 verses, calling them hypocrites, devourers of widows' houses, children of hell, blind guides, extortioners, whited sepulchres, serpents, generation of vipers, *persecutors of wise men*, and finally closes with this tremendous denunciation—"on whose head be all the *righteous blood*, shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom they slew between the temple and the altar."

The Christian system being thus opposed to all the hypocrisy and intrigue of designing men, to a phalanx of *church and state*, to all those who found it their interest to deceive the multitude, (to whom our Saviour preached) can we wonder that they combined in a *federal association* to destroy the efficacy of his doctrines, depreciate his reputation, and represent him and his followers as "turning the world upside down"? Can we suppose that any cordiality could ever exist between Him, who told the people (whom they had before held in subjection and dread) that they were deceivers and apostates? No; "for it came to pass *immediately* after he had finished *all these sayings*, that the *chief priests and scribes* assembled in the palace of the *high priest*, and consulted how they might take him by *subtlety*, and kill him; they said, not on the feast-day, lest there be an uproar *among The People*." In all this divine story, there seems to be two parties; *the people* in favour, and the *chief priests, &c.* in opposition. Till, at length, by the basest practices of bribery and persecution, (as in the instance of thrusting out the man cured of his blindness) they excited the fears of the populace, by crying out that religion was in danger; that his followers were not *Cæsar's friends*; and that he was a "pestilent fellow." By such inflammatory declarations. they so far persuaded the people to

consent to his crucifixion, as even to demand the release of Barabbas, rather than our Saviour. The "reign of terror," at that time, must have been of the most vindictive nature; for those who had experienced the efficacy of his miracles, were in general afraid to speak in his vindication. Nicodemus (though a ruler) dare not make his visits but in the most secret hours of the night. Joseph was cautious how far he acknowledged Him openly; and not till after the highest manifestations of his divinity, did he dare to beg the body, to be placed in his sepulchre.

Under this pressure of *clerical* and *civil* interest, we cannot be surprised that the multitude at length became the revilers of Him and his apostles. The clergy of that day, no doubt, preached sermons to influence the public mind. The multitude were told, that he meant to subvert all religion; that he was a despiser of ordinances; that he abused the *whole body* of the clergy; and that all property, all the churches, and every vestige of piety and morality would be annihilated. On all public occasions, it is probable, the "lawyer who tempted him" would be declaiming that the courts of justice would be abolished, and that he had denounced the whole sanhedrin of judges as hypocrites and devourers of widows' houses. When He, and his apostles, preached up peace on earth and good will towards men, the sycophants of the clerical party confounded every appeal to common sense, by crying out, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." Such was their influence in exciting the public odium, that even Paul and Silas were mobbed in Thessalonica, as men "*turning the world upside down.*" The enemies of the apostles had so far bewildered the people, that the charge of overturning religion was blended with the political heresy, that they did "*contrary to the decrees of Cæsar.*" All the beneficent actions of the apostles were styled "turning the world upside down"; all their exhortations were "modern philosophy," or, in other words, destroying those "steady habits" long imbibed under the discipline of pretended *orthodoxy*, or "blue law" establishments. To raise an opposition to men thus circumstanced, was not a difficult business to be accomplished, by their adversaries; a combination of such characters, all possessing an extensive personal influence, assisted with the electrical watch-word that *the church was in danger*, was an onset too powerful to be withstood by such weak "*missionaries*" (without purse or scrip) as Paul and Silas.

The foregoing observations are drawn from facts in the bible, which cannot be controverted ; they are mentioned to shew the effects of a combination of men, when united in opposition to any measures, however beneficial to the general interest of mankind ; especially if they have a tendency to weaken their influence, counteract their designs, or lessen their pecuniary emoluments. By creating a constant irritation in the public mind, they will prejudice the well-disposed, and, oftentimes, the well-informed citizens, against their best friends. They will persuade many, that those who are attempting to relieve the burdens of mankind, are “ *turning the world upside down* ” ; or, in other words, that keeping the people *upright*, in defence of their national rights, is *overturning* them. They will, by a continual clamour, excite suspicions against men whose moral characters can in no instance be impeached, and whose political sentiments are in unison with the fundamental principles of the Constitution.

If these events took place under the mild ministration of the christian system ; if it was possible to rouse the vengeance of the people against the doctrines which inculcated peace on earth and good will towards men ; can we be surprised, under a similar combination, they should now be under a temporary delusion, to mistake their political, as they then did their religious, blessings ? If it was *then* in the power of a junto of interested men to persuade the people that to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with God, were tenets destructive of the harmony of society, and that the preachers of such rational maxims were “ *turning the world upside down* ” ; we can easily perceive that the same practices on their credulity might persuade them, that lessening the public taxes, repealing a stamp-act, removing useless offices, abridging a supernumerary body of judges, and discharging the public debt, were equally as destructive to the happiness of the community ; and that the men who attempted to do these things were also, like Paul and Silas, “ *turning the world upside down.* ” A judge Bassett, like *Demetrius* of old, might, with equal success, cry out, “ *the CRAFT is in danger !* ”

I would here observe, that so far from wishing to depreciate the character of the *clergy*, as a *body*, by the foregoing observations, they are meant to place them in that respectable situation to which their profession entitles them. The history of the Christian relig-

ion justly appreciates the *sincere preachers* of the gospel. The apostles, and all true believers, were ever estimated as the “salt of the earth.” But our Saviour’s denunciations were solely confined to certain men, who styled themselves “*chief priests*” ; who assumed a control over church and state ; who were “busy-bodies” ; who were blending the politics of Cæsar with the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, &c. ; men who claimed precedence in all processions, and who minded earthly, more than spiritual, things. The clergy are a valuable body in society, and no man, who regards the welfare of his country would wish to see the more grade below their just estimation. But those, who aim at the rank of *chief priests*, and who calumniate (in sermons, orations, &c.) men much better than themselves, must, at this enlightened age, expect to fall into disrepute, unless they take more heed to their ways and become more circumspect in their manners.

Neither is there any intention to reflect on the *lawyers*, as a body, by mentioning one of the order as a *tempter* ; for if the Jewish sanhedrin could get but *one*, (and no doubt *he* was *well fee’d*,) it is rather a compliment on the profession : And we candidly hope, they could not procure *more than one* at the present day. The *known pecty* of the “order,” in these days, would secure them from having this charge brought against them.

## No. LXVI.

## THE TOWN-CLERK OF EPHEBUS !

TEXT—“ *And when the Town-Clerk had appeased the people, he said, ye men of Ephesus, what man is there that knoweth not how that the city of the Ephesians is a worshipper of the great goddess DIANA, and of the image which fell down from JUPITER ? Seeing then that these things cannot be spoken against, ye ought to be quiet and do nothing rashly. For ye have brought hither these men, who are neither robbers of churches, nor yet blasphemers of your goddesses. Wherefore, if Demetrius, and the craftsmen which are with him, have a matter against any man, the law is open and there are deputies ; let them implead one another.*”

THE scriptures were written for edification, and if we practise the doctrines they inculcate, we are promised not only the blessings of this life, but that which is to come. If any book inculcates *republicanism*, and reprobates an *aristocracy*, either *civil* or *ecclesiastical*, it is the Bible. The whole tenor of the sacred writings runs in unison with the rights of “THE PEOPLE,” in opposition to a certain “self-created” body, who assume the power to dictate and control public opinion. The “multitude,” and “the people,” are the only objects contemplated in all the addresses made by our Saviour and his apostles. If they now were on earth their language would be stigmatized as jacobinism and illuminati—if we heard them denouncing one monarchical magistrate as a “whited sepulchre”—if we saw them whipping out the money-changers—if we found them assembling the multitude, speaking to the people, and in every instance reprobating the chief priests as hypocrites and deceivers, our *junto gentry* would be clamorous in vociferating “away with them, away with them”—“crucify him, crucify him.”

The story of Paul’s entering Ephesus is a true representation of church infatuation, when set in motion by a few interested individ-

uals. On his arrival, and in order to counteract Paul's ministration, the seven sons of one Sceva, "*chief of the priests*," attempted to exercise the miraculous power of casting out evil spirits ; but though this same Sceva could deceive the people, yet he could not deceive the devil, for the man in whom the evil spirit was, "leaped on them and prevailed against them, and Sceva's seven sons fled out of the house naked and wounded." In this instance, Satan himself seemed to act with some generosity, for the evil spirits resorted on these deceivers with a degree of severity—"Jesus we know, and Paul we know, *but who are ye ?*" It is probable this Sceva was an artful priest, who had made himself very busy in exciting alarms among the people ; had told them that there was an organized body of illuminati, who were going to overturn all religion ; had propagated stories about massacres, and that the world was going to be "turned upside down." Sceva, therefore, thought he was competent to set up in opposition to Paul, and, by a little stratagem, could make his exorcism appear the genuine display of evangelical influence. In consequence of these artful proceedings, he and his seven sons had gained to themselves a high reputation at Ephesus ; and the people, acting under their infatuation, were led to lay violent hands on the apostles. The first attack on Paul, however, did not succeed ; Sceva was proved an impostor, and his sons were obliged to flee out of the house naked and wounded.

At length a more powerful antagonist appeared ; one Demetrius, a *silver-smith*, who made shrines for Diana, assembled his fellow-craftsmen, and began a most violent onset, by crying out, "*the craft is in danger ! great is Diana of the Ephesians !*" He further declared, if these men were suffered to proceed, the profits of his business would cease ; and emphatically concluded, "*We know, that by this craft we get our wealth.*" This hue and cry put the whole city in confusion ; some cried one thing and some another, and for two hours was heard the incessant clamour of "great is Diana of Ephesus !" Who could have thought a *silver-smith*, in the city of Ephesus, could have raised such a formidable party ?

In this state of things, what must have been the situation of Paul and his companions ! Sceva, and his seven sons, wounded and naked ; Demetrius, with his whole body of silver-god makers, rousing the people to the highest pitch of resentment ; the

whole city in uproar, against two or three unarmed men ; and it is to be feared, if the *Town-Clerk* had not came forward at this critical moment, to appease the people, they would have been stoned, or put to death, by Demetrius and his associates.

In this part of my observations, the reflections, which naturally occur, are :—that when any doctrine is inculcated, or any measure pursued, which interferes with the interest of men who practise on the religious prejudices of the people, it is their custom to alarm them, that all their religious ceremonies are to be abolished ; and to excite a jealousy and enthusiasm against the men who are endeavouring to relieve them from their impositions. This uproar was occasioned by Demetrius, not that he cared for the temple, otherwise than by making shrines, by which he and his fellow-craftsmen had enriched themselves at the expense of the ignorant Ephesians. If the apostles had proposed a number of golden or silver crucifixes, or had ordered a large paraphernalia of plated decorations for the altar, or *copper-bottomed* all the men-of-war at Ephesus, and had employed Demetrius to do the business, it is probable he would have been among the foremost to escort Paul into Ephesus. No doubt there would have been a high cavalcade, consisting of Demetrius' workmen, priests of the temple, and all the expectants, " more or less," of the apostle's patronage. Songs would have been sung in praise of Paul, and his religious system ; addresses would have been presented, from all the various orders of Church and State ; Sceva and his retinue would have been clothed in sacerdotal, and probably would have delivered an oration in favour of this modern philosophy. A public dinner would have been provided ; a poet-laureat chosen, and possibly all the young men been called on to celebrate the dissolution of the religion of Diana, and the city would have been in uproar with "*Great is Paul of Macedon !*" instead of "*Great is Diana of the Ephesians.*"

But it was not so—the Christian system offered no such excitements. Without purse, without scrip, the apostles had to travel from city to city ; they were at war with all money-getting religion ; they were not helping the magistrate to impose on the people, or the priest to attach the civil code to the horns of the altar ; even the religion itself was offered " without money and without price." No 'Peter's pence' was connected with Paul's embassy ;

what he got by the sale of his tents, was the principal part of his support. Who then can be surpris'd, that an uproar should be rais'd at Ephesus, where the religion of Paul struck all the silver gods out of existence. If Paul's religion had succeeded, how many temple-workmen would have been out of employ—Poor Demetrius would have been obliged to seek another mode of religion. Even though this silver-smith might have been employed in copper, or yet might have turned his attention to the iron foundery, still the little *silver gods* were a sure and lasting line of business, and he did not know how long the other might continue. If the goddess was destroyed, all his other employment was uncertain; he might have been permitted to fulfil some previous contract, but the temple! the temple! being annihilated, all the rest was as the "baseless fabric of a vision."

But the principal character in this story is the TOWN-CLERK. What an excellent thing it is to have a good Town-Clerk. Whether they chose this officer annually, or whether he was turn'd out the next election for the part he took against the priest Sceva, and Demetrius the silver-smith, we are not told; but that he acted like an honest man, on the present occasion, cannot be controverted. Amid the general convulsion of the citizens, and in opposition to the prevailing party, he had the resolution to speak to the people, and caution them against proceeding too rashly with the apostles.

It does not appear that he concern'd himself about the wounded sons of Sceva, or address'd himself to Demetrius, but he made immediate application to "THE PEOPLE." He began his speech with "ye men of Ephesus," and in order to give the true meaning of what I propose in this Number, I will attempt to modernize his language, and apply my discourse through the medium of the Town-Clerk.

"Ye men of Ephesus," why is all this uproar in the city? the men whom you charge with destroying religion, and robbing the churches, have in no instance done as you have been instructed. The churches remain in the same state of quietude as before, and the funding system (the modern temple of Diana) and all the other pecuniary establishments, are more permanent than under your former establishment. If Demetrius cannot get so much profit by his craft, yet you get more for your six per cents. your



bank stocks, and all other matters connected with your fiscal arrangements. If you are relieved from your stamp-duties, land-tax, loans at an extra interest, yet if Demetrius, by these measures, finds a drawback in his income, so much money is saved in your own pockets. Why then are you disturbed? What profit is it to you, to feed men who live by your earnings, and when every shilling they gain is a discount from your living? If the government is thus administered for your benefit, why should you make a riot because a number of *hangers-on* are *shaken off*, as incumbrances? Do the wheels of government need a clog? If five thousand men can be set at work to earn a living, without being burthen some to the community (as excise-officers, stamp-officers, &c.) is it any disadvantage to those who had to pay them? If the President tells you, he can answer all public exigencies without these taxes, why are you clamorous to burden yourselves, when he says he does not require it? We have a great number of Demetriuses who live by the craft of deception, and when they are thrown out of business they will make a great noise and disturb the city; but what is Demetrius to you? By feeding him, you starve yourselves. While he is furnishing silver gods at your expense, to burnish up the temple of Diana, you are growing poor, and depriving your wives and children of the means of sustenance. Of what service was a stamp-act? Did it make your property more secure? But if it is equally as secure without it, why do you clamour at its repeal? Of what service was a standing-army? While they were in existence, were your estates or your lives in less jeopardy? If they are now secure, why do you need them? Of what service was an eight per cent. loan? Did gratifying a few usurers, enrich you? Of what service was a land-tax? It served to create a host of officers, but the advantage was very small to those who paid it. If you can now ride in a chaise, without a tax, is it not better to apply this money to shoeing your horses, and mending the tackling, than supporting collectors?

Why then, "ye men of Ephesus," are you thus uneasy? Why all this uproar? Let Demetrius do as all honest citizens ought to do, earn his living by industry, and not by imposition. Support the men who are willing to relieve you from taxes; and never let the great city of Ephesus be again disturbed by a set of noisy, lazy

syccophants, who only pay court to those who feed them from honest men's pockets. Besides, why do you clamour in this incoherent manner? Bellowing "Adams and Liberty," "Jacobin," &c. convinces no man. If you have any charge against your magistrates, is not the law open? not the unwritten judiciary, not the vague common law of England, but the *written* laws of the land. Impeach them before the constituted authorities. Ye have deputies and lawyers in abundance; one half of the money you have given towards paying unnecessary officers, would be a handsome fee to the whole body of attorneys. Act like men, "ye citizens of Ephesus," and do not become a bye-word and derision among the citizens of the earth.

And when the Town-Clerk had thus spoken, each man went away to his own home, and the city was quiet.

## No. LXVII.

### THE WOLVES, AND THE NOBILITY.

TEXT—"The love of liberty (*says* SAMUEL ADAMS) is interwoven in the soul of man." "So it is, (*says* JOHN ADAMS) according to La Fontaine, in that of a wolf: and I doubt whether it be much more rational, generous, or social, in one than in the other, until in man it is enlightened by experience, reflection, education, and civil and political institutions, which are first produced, and constantly supported and improved by a FEW—that is, by the NOBILITY."

THE epistolary correspondence between Mr. John Adams and Mr. Samuel Adams is important, as it contains political principles which are highly interesting to the happiness and prosperity of this country. The Letters are written with that cordiality, as it relates to the opinion which they entertain of each other's integrity, that we are to view them as the established tenets of two old

civilians, who have made up their judgment from experience and reflection.

The extracts which I have taken, appear to comprize the essence of the controversy. On the one side, Mr. Samuel Adams says, "the love of liberty is interwoven in the soul of man"; Mr. John Adams answers, "so it is, according to La Fontaine, in that of a wolf"; and further declares, that "he doubts whether it is much more rational, &c. in one than in the other, until in man it is enlightened by experience, education, and *civil and political institutions*, which are at *first produced*, and constantly supported and improved by a *few*---that is, by the NOBILITY."

Here, then, these two gentlemen are at issue; and it is a question of the highest consideration which of them is the most accurate. If the love of liberty is not more rationally interwoven in the human soul than in a wolf, and if it wholly depends for existence on being cherished by a body of men, which he is pleased to style a "nobility," dreadful indeed is the situation of society. Does the history of mankind exhibit evidence, that a particular order of men, denominated *nobles*, feel those impressions, or are endowed with that benevolence, as to produce, cherish, and constantly support the liberties of the people? Are the people as savage as wolves? are they as ferocious and destructive, in their habits and manners, as this voracious animal? or are they "*their own worst enemies*," unless the benign hand of a *nobility* is stretched out for their protection? In what instance does this doctrine apply to the citizens of America? Were the first settlers of this country thus designated? Were our venerable forefathers as hostile as wolves to each other, when they landed on the American shores? Was not the love of liberty interwoven in their souls, when they forsook the luxurious soil of Britain, to seek an asylum in this desolate territory? Did they suppose it necessary to bring a body of *noblemen*, to protect them from devouring each other? or did they contemplate the establishment of political institutions, with a branch emphatically denominated a *nobility*? Did this aristocratic part of the British government give them any assistance, while they were contending against the arbitrary measures of England, before their embarkation? or did they receive consolation from the House of Lords, after their arrival? No; the love of liberty was interwoven in their souls, and they formed political institutions

founded on principles in every respect conformable to such feelings. Just emancipated from the thralldom of a British government, they were led to adopt a system of political regulation which gave the faculties of the mind their utmost energies, and never degraded themselves to contemplate their little society as wolves, standing in need of a superior order to check their sovereignty.

The sentiment advanced by Mr. John Adams, might have been expected from a crowned head in Europe ; it might have made a sublime paragraph in the writings of Burke : But that it should arise from a person who had been conversant in the history of this country, and had been in our councils during the American revolution, is rather a surprising and alarming consideration. I would ask Mr. John Adams, in what particular are the citizens of America in any degree analogous to wolves ? or in what instance has it been necessary that our political institutions should be improved and supported by a *nobility* ? Did the people shew any savage disposition in their contest with Britain ? Was it not the love of liberty, interwoven in the soul, that produced our opposition to British tyranny ? Our "town-meetings" were the pure effusions of liberty ; our "College" (*at that time*) breathed the spirit of freedom and the rights of man. The youth of that day, on commencement anniversaries, were eager to display the manly sentiments of freemen ; the orations and exhibitions all tended to rouse the mind to contemplate political subjects on the broadest basis of *equal rights*. Our patriots had the support of the people ; Faneuil-Hall and the OLD SOUTH often resounded with the acclamations of citizens, collected to support the great principles of their free constitution. The *tories*, it is true, considered the town of Boston as a den of wolves ; they supposed it necessary that a body of nobility should be created to check and control them ; Hutchinson and Oliver even wrote to the ministry for this purpose, and when their letters were discovered, the general disgust of the people convinced them in what abhorrence they were held.

Did not Mr. John Adams find that the spirit of liberty was interwoven in the soul of the people, when he was in Congress during our revolution ? It was this spirit that originated that body. The people called for this assembly of the States ; the election of the members was the evidence of the spirit of liberty

existing within them. The people had no idea that a body of nobility was necessary for their security ; they chose honest men from among them, who were in the same grades of life with themselves ; they did not vote for *my Lord Such-a-one*, or *Duke Such-a-one* ; the candidates in general were scarcely complimented with the title of *esquire*. When this respectable body assembled, whom did they address ? Were not all their applications made to the people ? Who formed the army ? Did not tradesmen and farmers compose the American phalanx ? Who commanded and manned our ships of war and privateers ? were they dukes, earls, or lords ? No ; the people—the people—the plain American citizens, whose souls were invigorated with liberty, unawed by a nobility, and who disdained to consider themselves under their immediate protection ; these were the soldiers who fought our battles ; these were the sailors, who, even at that period, rendered the flag of America respectable and dreaded.

I cannot but wonder how a sentiment of the kind could be advanced by Mr. John Adams. That the people are not more rational in support of their liberties than *wolves*, unless supported by a *nobility*,—is, of all declarations, the most extraordinary. In the days of adversity, Mr. John Adams knew the obligation he was under to the people ; a sentiment of this kind, coming from a member of our first Congress, would have raised the continent to a flame. Suppose it had then been said, that the people cannot be trusted ; we must have a nobility to govern ; we must put this nobility into a “ *hole*,” and from this subterraneous cell we must rely for all our succour. The British army would have been pleased with such a visionary opposition ; Lord Howe would rather have heard of one hundred thousand noblemen in a “ *hole*,” than twenty thousand Yankees in the field. *Bunker-Hill* was not defended by men thus in covert ; no, the citizens did not lurk in *holes*, but stood on eminences. Warren scorned to be hid in a cave, but stood in the front rank, in defence of that liberty which was interwoven in his soul, and in the souls of his brave companions. The immortal Washington looked to his comrades of citizen-soldiers ; he did not inquire whether there was a body of nobility to secure his retreat. He did not view his chosen band as *wolves*, but considered himself at the head of men, whose souls were invigorated with the powerful energies of liberty.

If the love of liberty (as is declared by Mr. Samuel Adams) was not interwoven in the soul of man, it would have been impossible to have effected the Independence of America. What but this sustained the spirits of an army constantly on fatigue? What but this cheered the war-worn foldier, when destitute of clothing and the common necessaries of life? What but this animated the American veterans to contend against the formidable troops of Britain, with scarcely a cartridge for their defence, or a drop of cheering comfort in their canteens? What spirit short of this, rallied the undisciplined troops of Starks, to attack and capture the boasting Burgoyne? To what energy of the human mind are we indebted for the surrender of Cornwallis? Was it the refined speculations of a nobility groping in a hole, or was it the irresistible impulse of freemen, embodied to express those feelings which were interwoven in every fibre of their souls?

I would not wish to put an uncandid construction on the paragraph selected from the Letters, but if there is any precise idea expressed by Mr. John Adams, it appears to be this—that the people are as voracious, savage and irrational as *wolves*, unless they are enlightened by political institutions, which are at *first produced, constantly supported, and improved* by a NOBILITY. If I am not correct in my conclusions, I shall readily acknowledge my error; but the English language cannot convey a stronger idea to my mind of the real political principles of any individual, however disagreeable may be the application.

Admitting my premises to be substantiated, how far does Mr. John Adams's declaration conform to our bill of rights, which emphatically states, "that government is instituted for the common good—that *the people alone* have an incontestible, *unalienable* and indefeasible right to institute government—that the idea of a man born a magistrate, law-giver, or judge, is absurd and unnatural." If Mr. John Adams is right the constitution is wrong; for if the people are as untractable as wolves, without a nobility, is it not preposterous for them to attempt to institute a form of government, which in no instance recognizes that essential branch which is to preserve the harmony of their social compact?

If a nobility is alone to preserve us, where in the name of common sense are we to find our saviours: Are we to search for them among the Essex junto, or are we to look for them among those

who consider the people as wolves ? Born in a land settled by a fraternity of persecuted republicans ; living under a constitution and laws which embrace every citizen on the terms of equality, in what corner or hole of this extensive territory are the people to look for help and assistance detached from themselves ? After experiencing the blessings of their *own protection*, from the first settlement of the country to the present hour, is it possible, that they should now distrust their own competency, irreverently denounce the guardianship of heaven, and throw themselves into the arms of a nobility ? We will not thus affront heaven—we will not thus dishonour our forefathers—we will not thus entail misery on our posterity.

## No. LXVIII.

## THE NOBILITY IN A HOLE.

TEXT—“ *The only way, God knows, is to put these Families into a HOLE by themselves, and set two watches upon them : a Superior to them all, on one side, and the People on the other.*”

Mr. John Adams's Letter to Mr. Samuel Adams.

WHILE we read the political sentiments of Mr. John Adams, it is natural to consider them as the deliberate reflections of a civilian, who has long been in the study of government, and who has formed a system, if not perfect, yet consistent with his former avowed principles of republicanism. But it is difficult to bring *all* his doctrines to that point, by which we can draw a rational conclusion.

The strength of his government consists in political institutions, which he says, “ *are first produced, and constantly supported and improved by a NOBILITY.*”—These are the men to whom the people are to look for protection and happiness. But after Mr. Adams had thus created his grand bulwark, and clothed his pre-eminent characters with the most extensive powers, he seems to be *ashamed*

of the work of his own hands—for, strange to relate, this conservative body are to be “put in a hole” ; nay, he expresses it more fully, by calling “God” to witness, that the “only way is, to put them into a *hole by themselves.*”

Fellow-citizens,—Fancy to yourselves that the United States should be under a government similar to what is recommended by Mr. John Adams. In the first place, you must depreciate your own characters, by admitting yourselves as incapable of governing without this nobility, as “wolves.”—You must view yourselves in possession of all the ferocious, voracious and exterminating passions of this savage of the wilderness ; you must view each other as a band of robbers, freebooters and ruffians ; you must totally renounce every humane faculty of the soul ; your fingers you must consider as claws, your hands as fangs, your teeth as daggers, and the former harmony of your voice, when assembled to deliberate, as the terrific yells of the most sanguinary beasts of the forest. After you have thus brought yourselves to this depth of degradation, you are to seek among a particular number of families, a body of men, on whose protection you are to rely, and who are to take you under their “*holy keeping.*” But the farce is not yet complete—for after you have clothed them with this extensive power, and arrayed them in their gorgeous robes, you are to deposit these highly respected dignitaries in a “HOLE,” there to remain hidden from the public eye ; and thus in *secret* to work out the salvation of the people. Surely there must be some magical operation to communicate these blessings, otherwise these *subterraneous conservators* must be puzzled to distribute those benefits, as they mature them within their *cells.*

I am not disposed to treat the sentiments of Mr. J. Adams with an indecent severity, by distorting his propositions ; but I am persuaded, if such a plan had been published in a newspaper as a serious system of government, and the name of the author was unknown, it would have excited universal derision.—For admitting Mr. Adams’s premises to be right, that a nobility is necessary, and that they are to “produce, support and improve the political institutions,” for the good of the people, yet nothing can be more unseemly than putting such a respectable body in a “hole.” If they are serviceable, why should they be hid ? Why should they not be in a commanding situation to view the “whole ground” ?



Why should they be withdrawn from the view and inspection of the people, while they were so assiduous to promote their welfare?

It may be considered a puerile play on words, in commenting so minutely on this expression; but to use Mr. Adams's own words, "God knows" what he means by a *hole*, unless it is to place a body of men intirely out of the reach and sovereignty of the people. It is true, he is for placing "two watches upon them; a superior to them all, on one side, and the people on the other;" but here the system clashes, for if the people are as ungovernable as "wolves," without this nobility, there appears an absurdity that they should have any voice in checking them. If this nobility are so enlightened as to "*produce, support, and improve* our political institutions," and the people are so destitute of *self-preservation* as to be incapable of governing themselves without them, it must certainly introduce a jargon in the system, if they should ultimately have authority to counteract those establishments which this well-informed body had sanctioned.

The premises laid down by Mr. John Adams destroy his conclusions; for he places the people as destitute of natural propensities to establish political institutions, while at the same time he makes them (in connexion with another unnamed power) the final compeers in the business. If they are not adequate to these purposes in the first instance, how do they become equal to the final decision? They remain "*wolves*" through the whole process, as we cannot suppose this body, deposited in a *hole*, can create in the people any new properties which they did not possess in their primary state. This "modern philosophy" is a composition of strange, incoherent ingredients; the absurdity is evident when we analyze it; and in order to shew the folly of such a system, let us see how far the doctrine would have held during our opposition to Britain.

Suppose Hutchinson and Oliver had effected their purposes when they applied to the British ministry for a similar mode of government? The nobility of that day were the families of Hutchinson, Oliver, Vassals, &c. This nobility were to be placed in a situation somewhat similar to Mr. Adams's "*hole*;" that is, in a place where the people could not come at them. These 'well-born' individuals were to "*produce, support and improve* the

*political institutions*" of America. The "superior" power, at that day, would have been the king of England. Under this organized system, had the Congress of the United States assembled, and disapproved of the measures of this king and nobility, the question is, how far these two branches of the government would have "*supported and improved*" the measures of *John Hancock, Samuel Adams, GEORGE WASHINGTON, THOMAS JEFFERSON, JOHN ADAMS, &c.* who constituted the power which arose from the people? Rebels! Rebels! Wolves! Wolves! would have been echoed and re-echoed through the continent, and probably John Hancock and Samuel Adams would have been proscribed as the most ferocious animals in the whole pack. Certainly Mr. John Adams would never have been elevated to the Chief Executive of the United States; he might have remained a pleader at the bar, but it is highly improbable he would have had the authority to appoint a whole bench of judges, or have placed himself in a situation to propose a form of government, which embraced the leading features of the British constitution. The king of England, and the nobility in the hole, would have controled all proceedings which led to our revolution; and provided Congress had had resolution to raise an army, and appoint Washington as commander, even the Congress, army, and Washington, would have been consigned, not merely to a "hole," but to the *bottomless pit*. Principles must be founded on facts.—Speculative whims are not required in this country; we have gone through a contest which fully explains all such controversial points—we know what a *king* is, we know what a nobility is, and we know what the people are; and I will venture to say, that nothing short of the immediate interposition of heaven can maintain their rights, but *themselves*, and the man is lunatic who says they are "their own worst enemies." The enlightened state of this country does not require men in a HOLE to govern them; the people are not only sovereign by *inheritance*, but sovereign from *information*.

Citizens of Massachusetts!—Are you not competent to your political concerns? When ye meet as a legislature, do you require a body of nobility to make your laws, or to draft your resolves? Are ye inadequate to vote salaries to your governour, judges, and others? Do ye require a body of nobility, with the extra compensations for their titles, to carry on the measures of the

Commonwealth? Will the house of representatives declare themselves incapable to transact the business which annually comes before them, unless they have a body of nobility to produce and improve their civil institutions?

Citizens of New-Hampshire!—What say ye?—are ye willing to surrender your rights, and submit your welfare to a body of men thus organized and authorized? Will ye trust the salary of your governor, &c. to men in a *HOLE*?

Citizens of Connecticut!—What say ye?—does a nobility accord with your “steady habits”? Where are ye to select your dignified order? Who among you have superior knowledge to alter and improve your economical system? In what *HOLE* in your State, can you deposit a Connecticut nobility? Are Simsbury mines the place of refuge?

Citizens of Rhode-Island!—Come forward, and produce *your nobility*;—where are the highly favoured families, who have a claim on your gratitude, so far, as to surrender your privileges exclusively into their hands? We presume there are none; we trust that you have been, now are, and ever will be competent to regulate yourselves. The steady habits of New-England rise indignant at such new-fangled doctrines, and we hope the ensuing election will convince the *advocates* for a nobility, that not even a *descendant* from them, must ever expect to receive the suffrages of independent electors? Let us convince the world, that Americans are not wolves, by supporting a government which is not accursed with a nobility.

Citizens of the Northern States!—Let me ask you, how far you can connect the politics of Washington with those of Adams? The former never degraded the people with the appellation given them by the latter; Washington ever revered the people, and considered them capable of protecting themselves; he never advocated the establishment of a nobility to support their rights; how then can we cry “WASHINGTON and ADAMS”? Let us not be deceived by names, but let us examine principles, and when we find that Mr. John Adams is derogating from the sovereignty of the people, and is for placing a nobility above them, we cannot consistently attach his name to that of Washington, who in every instance was opposed to such pernicious doctrines. It is but of very little consequence whether we formerly had a nobility palmed

upon us by the intrigue of Hutchinson, or it now should be effected by the plausibility of Adams. In either case, our ruin would be inevitable. The fact is, the plan proposed by Hutchinson and Oliver, to the British ministry, was in unison with that which Mr. John Adams advocates in his Letter to his friend. He, and he alone, who is in favour of a nobility, and who wishes to degrade the people, can subscribe to the political tenets of Mr. John Adams. Washington and Jefferson accord with more melody in the ears of republicans. Let us then be true to our principles, and not sacrifice them to pride, ostentation and folly.

---

## No. LXIX.

### ON PRESIDENT WASHINGTON'S PROCLAMATION OF NEUTRALITY.

**P**RESIDENT Washington's proclamation, on the principles of "*impartial neutrality*" agreeably to the "*modern law of nations*," was considered at the period of its promulgation so interesting to the commercial part of the United States, that a great majority of the seaports assembled to discuss the instrument. This town, in particular, expressed their sentiments on the subject. The word "*impartial*" was objected to by some, but the *confidence* placed in the determination of the executive, to support our commerce on the broad basis of the *modern law of nations*, even qualified this exceptionable expression.

I would here inquire, whether every man in the town-meeting did not consider his property then at sea, and all he should hereafter send, as completely guaranteed upon the principles of the proclamation? Did any merchant, at that time, (after the most solemn assurances of the President) conceive that his navigation was floating upon an *uncertainty* whether any measures would be adopted, by the federal government, to prevent the violation of that neutrality declared by the executive? Did any man indulge a suspicion,

that the British officers would be permitted to intercept our legal trade with the powers at war, while our cargoes consisted of such articles as were expressly declared in the "*modern law*" as not subject to capture? Or could any citizen suppose, that our government would submit to the arrogance of British orders (issued immediately after the proclamation) to take all American vessels bound to France, "*let their cargoes be what they may*"?

Impossible, that this should be the idea of any man: but on the contrary, every one felt a *security* that the power, which had pledged itself upon the "*modern law*" of nations, would possess that national consistency, as to defend the citizens against any wanton breaches of its fundamental principles. They certainly could not expect, that the authority which had promulgated the doctrine would ever relinquish it.

It may here be replied, that the President *intended* to vindicate this right, but the *British nation* not having consented to the *modern law* we were unavoidably exposed to their depredations. But, if we examine the proclamation, we shall find, that the President pledged our commerce even *against the British*; for, among the powers enumerated, "Great-Britain" is expressly mentioned. There was no exception to any of the belligerent powers; but the proclamation was a decisive manifesto to them *all*, that the commerce of the United States was guaranteed by the executive upon the *modern law* of nations. If Great-Britain was not considered as being *bound by it*, the wisdom of the President would naturally have led him to an explanation on this point; and unless he had intended to vindicate his proclamation against the depredations of this nation, his prudence would have cautioned him not to excite a false hope in the merchants that their property would be secured against them. The President knew, that he had made a declaration of *his determination* to *all* the powers at war, and, as far as his proclamation went, he had taken a responsible part in the European controversy. It was an EXECUTIVE PASSPORT, to all our merchants and seamen, proclaiming in the most explicit terms their security under it.

The proclamation was issued by the chief magistrate of an independent nation, and as such, was a public, unequivocal manifestation of this disposition. It was taking a side, as it respected the particular advantages to the United States, arising from the con-

vulned state of other nations. It was commencing a commercial war, in case *any power* attempted to violate it. To say, then, that *the British* were not bound by it, and that we must submit to them, is no more than declaring, that the President had made a proclamation which he had not fully considered; and that he had pledged himself to the belligerent powers to do that, which he could not maintain. In either case, the censure is too pungent on this superior character, and those who argue thus, reflect too severely on his wisdom, prudence, and foresight.

The proclamation (if I may use the expression) was *something* or *nothing*. If it was *something*, the substance of it ought to be retained: If it was *nothing*, the assembling of the merchants, to approbate the measure, was a "found, and nothing else."

As an individual, I expected, on the meeting of Congress, that this proclamation would have been the ground-work of all our political decisions; that the *friends to the President* would have nourished the principles which it contained, and made them the polar star of all their proceedings. But so far from this, these *nominal friends* to the President considered it of little moment, and their speeches, instead of advocating this official instrument, rather condemned it in every paragraph. The *modern law* of nations is scarcely mentioned by them; but attempts to palliate the British spoliations, on the *ancient law*, seemed to be the whole tendency of their arguments.

It is worthy of remark, that those members in Congress, who were advocating a system to give efficacy to the proclamation, were immediately denounced in certain papers as *enemies to the President*; as attempting to drive this country into a war; as friends to anarchy, and enemies to the federal government:—whereas, the *proclamation* naturally led those persons into the measures they advocated, as being the only remedy *they* could adopt, to prevent the violation of the modern law. Mr. Madison contemplated the subject on this principle. He considered the staple resources of this country, adequate to all the important purposes of the proclamation. If the ground which the President had taken was *tenable*, he was assiduous, as a member of the Legislature, to substantiate it by every possible exertion, and national effort. The more effectually to do this, he had recourse to that impregnable fortress, the COMMERCE of the United States—a fortress which has ever been

considered as our **STRONG HOLD**, by all the writers on the British trade. His sentiments are in unison with the patriots of the several state conventions, and with the merchants of this town in 1786, as the speeches and votes will fully testify. The same measures were advocated by Vice-President Adams, while residing at the British court. This gentleman declared, at that period, that a systematic restriction on the British commerce would effect the highest advantages to this country. Mr. Dayton, and Mr. Clark, also enlisted in the controversy, and commenced champions in defending the proclamation, by proposing such energetic measures as would place America in that forcible situation as to *command* indemnification. These gentlemen knew that we had neither an army, nor a navy, to carry into operation the purposes of the executive, but that the "strong arm of the Union" consisted principally in commercial exertions, and contending with Britain on the ground of mercantile retaliation.

By this representation of the business, can the citizens hesitate who were the *real friends* to the President? Whether the men who were supporting the measures of the British on the *ancient law*, or those who were condemning them on the *modern*? Those who were palliating the hostile proceedings of the British, while acting in direct opposition to the President's proclamation, or those who were attempting to counteract them? Those who have advocated a treaty which has destroyed every principle of the proclamation, by annihilating the modern law, and reviving the ancient; which exposes our commerce to capture, our seamen to impressment, and abandons the merchant to seek indemnification, *at his own cost*, to the British courts; or those who have uniformly endeavoured to vindicate our national rights, upon the most solemn pledge that could be given by the President? On these questions, let the impartial citizens judge.

The conclusions from the above premises are, that the President, in the plenitude of his patriotism, attempted to promote the commerce of the United States, upon the *modern law of nations*. His *nominal friends*, by their measures, defeated *his intentions*, by advocating the *ancient law*. His *real friends* endeavoured to support him, by having recourse to the commercial resources of the country. They were also baffled in their exertions. The principles of the proclamation are totally destroyed by the treaty, and

the merchants are now *obliged* to look for indemnification to the British government, instead of holding to the President's proclamation, on the *stability of which* they originally ventured their property.

---

## COMMERCIAL COMPARISON BETWEEN FRANCE AND ENGLAND.

IN looking over the statement of Mr. Tench Cox, of the *exports* to the several nations of Europe, I find that the amount to the British is 9,218,540 dollars ; and to the French, 12,653,635 dollars. As it respects the *amount* to the two nations, the French hold the advantage of about three millions. But it is observed on this statement in the Centinel, "that these exports is a powerful proof of the blessings we have enjoyed from our neutrality, notwithstanding the many spoliation on our commerce." I would ask, how this is evident, as it relates to the *British* ? We have exported upwards of nine millions to Britain, but by the statements of the merchants, in their late representation to Congress, the British have captured upwards of five millions. How then do the blessings appear on the side of Britain, when they have captured above one half of the amount of our exports ? The principal controversy on the subject of our commerce is, how far our "impartial neutrality" has been beneficial from the amity of the British ? Their conduct is brought to a decisive point, for we have the statement of Mr. Cox, as to the *exports*, and the representation of the merchants as to the *captures*. The blessings are therefore known by deducting the latter from the former, and we find that the balance is against us.

Besides, in the calculation of the blessings, we are to consider the captures made since the ratification of the treaty, not only of our property, but of our seamen. In this estimate, therefore, we may fairly allow that the largest sum exported to this amicably-disposed nation has been captured.



To calculate the real blessings, we must take into consideration our *imports*. Whether the imports from France have been more beneficial than from England, let us consider the cargoes from the different powers. From France, we have received the principal part of our HARD MONEY. The banks have been mostly supported by the deposits from French voyages. The returns, from this quarter, have enriched the merchants and farmers. But I will defy any man to show the advantages from the English importations; unless a cargo of their manufactures, consisting of every species of luxury, can be put in competition with SOLID COIN. The balance of trade with England is greatly against us. Millions of dollars are exported, by Mr. Jefferson's report to Congress, to pay our arrearages, while our trade with France has enriched the country with an immense circulating medium. To set this business right, and that the people should not be deceived by partial statements, let Mr. Coxe give the imports from the several countries, and the *contents of the cargoes*, and we shall then be able to judge as to the benefits of our commerce.

A further consideration is, that notwithstanding the immense advantages to the British by the American commerce; notwithstanding our declared neutrality, and the pains taken by our government to prevent every imposition being practised on their trade, yet they have steadily pursued measures to injure us in every direction. Since the treaty was signed have they shewed us any particular favour? Has our commerce been more free from embarrassments? Have they shewed the least disposition to convince the Americans of their friendship?

If we could observe the smallest evidence of British amity, we might conclude, that our conduct was the effect of political policy. But if we *must submit*, upon the principles of Mr. Ames and Mr. Sedgwick, because the Indian tomahawk will become the umpire of decision, we may go on, till every trait of our national character is obliterated. Let us at least take some political position, otherways the British will inevitably reduce this country, to the humiliating situation of colonies. The speeches of the foregoing gentlemen, lead us to this point, and the disposition of the British is such, as will push them to the accomplishment of this object. These speeches are but little short of a declaration of the surrender

of our sovereignty and independence, and that we must hereafter depend on the mercy of that nation, for the support of every blessing acquired by our revolution.

---

## No. LXX.\*

### CLERICAL ADDRESS TO PRESIDENT ADAMS.

*To Mr. David Osgood, Moderator, and Mr. Jedidiah Morse, Scribe,  
of the Convention of Ministers.*

“**A**S MINISTERS OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE,” the address of the *Congregational Clergy* to President Adams claims the particular attention of your fellow-citizens.

The political situation of this country in connexion with the republic of France, calls on those who profess to be actuated by the benevolent spirit of religion, to express their sentiments with that *moderation*, as will convince the *world* that *party zeal* forms no part of their christian character. Candour and benevolence are traits more congenial with the religion you profess, than invective and indiscriminate censure.

“As ministers of peace, assembled in annual convention,” (to adjust no doubt your particular professional concerns) what could lead you to pass your anathemas on the citizens of France, as “atheistical, licentious, and disorganizing”? As having “produced the greatest crimes and miseries, in their own country, and diffusing their baneful influence even to distant nations”?

Indiscriminate charges ill become men of your station in society. I would request you, gentlemen, to reflect on the state of religion in France, previous to the revolution: and then you will be able to judge, how far the state of the christian system is changed from that *purity* which it formed under the monarchy. It cannot be supposed, that you will pretend to advocate the principles on which religion was *then* founded; when the mind was fet-

---

\* This, and the foregoing Number, were not originally published under the signature of Old-South.

tered with all the abominable tenets and dogmas of the popish hierarchy ; when the deluded citizens were bound to submit to the *infallibility of priests* ; and when thousands were immured in convents, to groan under the tortures and impositions inflicted on them by a herd of rapacious monks, and voracious friars. Was the state of religion in France, of that *evangelical nature*, and so consonant to the dictates of the Christian system, that you now deplore the change ? Do you feel afflicted that the Supreme Being has overthrown an ecclesiastical tyranny, which for ages has been considered as a scourge to the church of Christ ? whose massacres and crimes have rendered the page of history a scene too abhorrent and sanguinary for the human mind to contemplate ? Can you arraign the wisdom of heaven in thus destroying that *man of sin*, whom God himself had declared should be thrown into perdition ? or do you sympathize with *his holiness*, that the predictions of the gospel have been verified in his downfall ? Surely, gentlemen, if you make the bible your study, or if you believe in the prophets, your pious reflections would carry you to adore the justness of the Supreme Being, in these important events, rather than to vent your resentment against *those instruments* which he has been pleased to employ.

But, gentlemen, you say, they are *now deistical* : You appear concerned that the work is not done *to your approbation*. In this particular, however, you have assumed an inquisitorial authority, unbecoming your characters, either as *American citizens*, or Christians.—As Americans, what right have you to interfere in their religious establishments ? While you are peaceably worshipping in your own parishes, what have you to do with the religion of France ? No French priests molest your devotions ; why then do you issue your bulls against them ? No convention in France, at their annual meeting, have charged you with being disorganizers, or destroyers of social order ; why then should you place yourselves as arbiters of their Christian concerns ?

The fact is, gentlemen, the religion of France is established on the broad basis of catholicism, which admits every man to worship God, according to the dictates of his conscience. They have emancipated the human mind from that thralldom, with which domineering priests have for centuries fettered it. Each citizen judges for himself, on his eternal concerns, and is now left to

pay his adoration to Deity, undeterred from the resentment of an arbitrary priesthood. The various sects of professionalists pursue unmolested their religious devotions, and every man (let his religion be what it may) can attend a place of worship with equal security and protection as in any town or city in the United States.

That some philosophers in France are deists, is not denied. But, gentlemen, where are not these characters to be found? In England, and in America, we find men of this principle. Great statesmen, and men of benevolent minds, have been philosophers of this description. But your candour, it is presumed, will not condemn either England or America, because some men of this profession have differed from you on this speculative point.

You have, gentlemen, been misled as to the principles of the French government, in matters of religion. The British papers have chiefly been the medium of our intelligence, on this subject. They have pictured the deistical state of France, just to suit their particular purposes; and under cover of these deceptions, they have attempted to raise the prejudices of their own subjects, and the detestation of the American citizens, against the nation. But let an impartial man read the *history of England*, during their wars: The horrid devastations they have spread in all those countries they have conquered: *The persecutions of the clergy of your order, even in England*: The martyrs who have fell a sacrifice to the sanguinary edicts of their government: The destruction which their armies spread in America, and which was peculiarly aimed at the *houses of worship*. Charlestown can testify to their conflagrations, and the citizens of Boston have witnessed their sacrilegious prostitution of our religious temples. Your abhorrence, then, ought not to be confined to France, and your censures should not be particularly aimed to defame this nation, in exclusion of Britain.

If, in your zeal, you are deploring the state of religion, or if your convention assembled with "fervent wishes and prayers for the *universal extension of national liberty*, social order, and christian piety," why were you wholly confined to vent your invectives against France? If *universal extension of national liberty* was your fervent wish, why are you silent while you hear the groans of the afflicted Irish? Their murders, ravages, and desolation, cry

aloud to the God of Sabaoth ; and, as his vicegerents, deploring the unhappy state of mankind, your prayers ought to accompany their agonizing complaints.

You, gentlemen, in particular, were advocates for the British treaty ; but, if *religion is the subject of controversy*, how could you be so desirous to commence a connexion with that nation whose vindictive rage first drove our forefathers to the wilderness of America ; and, from that period, has been assiduous to establish an hierarchy to undermine those *congregational establishments* on which yours are founded ? Has Bonaparte, like archbishop Laud, and other ecclesiastics, in his addresses to the clergy, spoke the language of a ruffian ? Has not the former, rather preached to them of righteousness, charity, and benevolence ? Has he not told them to follow the precepts of the Master whom they presume to imitate ? In what page of the English history can you find the *conqueror* thus exhorting the *conquered* to acts of kindness, patriotism, and philanthropy ?

But, gentlemen, it may be said, that, *as a government*, the French have reprobated the principles of religion. This certainly does not appear, while they tolerate religion of every description. The Jews, and the various orders of devotees, have perfect liberty in France to pursue their respective modes of worship. The French, in their constitution, allow the superintendence of the Supreme Being. It is thus introduced : “ The French people proclaim, in the presence of the SUPREME BEING.” This is more than is acknowledged by the federal constitution. The constitution of the United States begins with “ We the people.” No mention is made of the Supreme Being, nor no acknowledgment of his government, direction, or blessing. It would be judging hardly of the citizens of the United States, if any power in Europe, on this account, should object to an alliance with us, as *atheists*. The Dey of Algiers inquired of our minister, whether we were *Christians* ; and his answer was, that the constitution made no distinction between Christians and Mahometans. The Dey was pleased with the idea, and esteemed our connexion the more valuable on that account.

The desultory conversation in the French convention, on religion, no doubt, produced many speculative opinions : and if a debate in our Congress, on this subject, should take place, it is proba-

Ele some deistical opinions would be broached by certain high federalists. But would it be candid for the clergy of England to reprobate the Americans as deists, for the imprudencies of a few individuals in Congress? Or would it be right in them to suppose, that a *general decay* of religion had prevailed in America, and that we were all turned deists, because a particular body of the clergy, "in and about Cambridge," had published an address, representing a *general non-attendance* on public worship? An address of this kind was published in our public papers, about a year since; but no king, potentate, priest, or prelate in Europe has anathematized America on this account, nor thought it of importance to issue their bulls against that fountain of science, (Cambridge) from whence have issued so many streams to make glad the city of our God.

The French, it is true, have no ecclesiastical titles, as Right Reverend Father in God, His Holiness, or Reverend. These form no part of the religious vocabulary. Neither Aaron, the prophets, apostles, nor evangelists, arrogated to themselves these attributes; and it is a serious consideration, whether the clergy, who have since assumed these appellations, will not have to answer for their presumption to a *jealous God*, on the great day of retribution! "Holy and Reverend is HIS NAME."

I shall conclude, gentlemen, this lengthy address with my fervent prayers and wishes, that you would attend to that important Work for which you are ordained: To be less attentive to the amusements, recreations, and politics, of this world: To endeavour to soothe the passions, rather than to inflame them. For "as *ministers of peace*" it becomes you, *at your annual convention*, to study those things that lead to reconciliation, rather than to urge the people by *partial representations* into a war.

## No. LXXI.

TO THEOPHILUS PARSONS, ESQ.

AS you have withdrawn the *plea*, which you solemnly pledged yourself to the court to argue, the public are not furnished with the documents on which you predicated your appeal. As you have thus left the question in this crude state, there is nothing remaining on which to animadvert, but the *impropriety* of your conduct.

A gentleman so long in the practice of the law, it is presumed, is well acquainted with the importance of the judiciary branch of government. In this department are suspended the lives, liberty and property of the citizens. Public confidence therefore is essential to its administration, and every wanton attempt to derogate from its respectability, must be acknowledged as highly reprehensible.

When the judges assemble, impanel the jury, and the crier announces the organization of the court, it is taken for granted that the *jurisdiction* is authorized by the constitution. At this period, if an individual should arrest the proceedings, by a plea which strikes at its existence, it is an act of assumption which demands the highest authority for his conduct. The judiciary, thus moving in a legal and formal direction, is as sacred as the ark of old; and if any man attempts to impede its progress, he is as amenable to the laws of society, as the disturber of the ancient building to the penal sanction of the SUPREME BEING. As citizens, we have a right to inquire, by what authority any part of the business of the present court was suspended by your interference?

It is understood, sir, that your plea involved in it, not merely the jurisdiction of the court on a particular action, but struck at the foundation on which the judiciary superstructure was raised. The judges, with the utmost condescension, referred your question to be argued at 10 o'clock on the next day. In the interim the

court was adjourned, and certain actions were suspended till you had offered the arguments in support of your allegation.

During this intermission, the public mind was agitated ; the courts of law were considered as palsied ; the actions depending were hung up as doubtful in their issue ; the jury were retarded in the accomplishment of their business ; in short, the laws of the country, for twenty-four hours, if not annihilated, were judged by many as progressing to a dissolution.

The hour arrived, sir, in which this interesting question was to be argued. The court assembled, and sat in solemn suspense, whether they were, or were not a constitutional jurisdiction, competent to the purposes of trying *all causes* which were presented on the docket. At this awful crisis, it was announced, that you had waved the consideration of the question, which the day before you had pledged yourself to urge—or, in plain English, that *Theophilus Parsons, Esquire*, had *permitted* the court of justice to proceed on business without any further interruption !

An individual thus to trifle with a court of justice, is an indecency, in my opinion, of the greatest magnitude. If, sir, you had previously weighed the subject, (which undoubtedly it was your duty to do) why did you not appear at the hour assigned, and offer your reasons in support of your plea ? Why did you not decently come forward, and beg pardon for your temerity, or boldly maintain the controversy ? Is there not a respect due to the judiciary, when a *lawyer* presumes to challenge its jurisdiction ? or ought he thus sport with the court by evading the question ? Are the public to depend on the flexibility of your nerves, or do you consider yourself as the *pivot* on which the tribunals of our government are to turn ? Do you assume an *exclusive* jurisdiction to stop courts, or set them in motion at your pleasure ? Are you the organ of a disaffected party to convulse the United States, on the subject of the judiciary, or have you a conservative power to control the national government ? How can you answer for the suspension of the powers of this court, while you have no other apology for your conduct, than the sovereignty of your own will, by which you checked its legal progress ? Can you compensate for the inconveniences attending such suspension, to those whose causes were involved in the decision ? Answer, sir, as a citizen and a lawyer.



A particular body of men, of late have placed themselves in an attitude which appears calculated to *stop the wheels of government*. They assume an arrogance of deportment to which no free government ought to submit ; they seem to sport with the constituted authorities, and the laws of Congress are treated by them with the utmost disrespect. The executive in particular is abused with the grossest calumny ; every officer of government, sanctioned by the President, is the immediate object of scurrility and defamation ; no man, but whom the junto approve, escapes with impunity. They appear to arrogate legislative, executive and judiciary authority ; the acts of the legislature are denounced, if they are not agreeable to their principles ; all measures of the President are anathematized if they do not conform to their wishes, and even justice is shaken in its seat, unless the scales are held in a direction graduated by them.

If, sir, you mean to take a bold stand, come forward in a character equal to the magnitude of the subject, and mark precisely your lines of entrenchment ; do not sport upon visionary motions and pleas, on which you are cautious of risking a *personal responsibility* ; do not trifle with courts of justice, but if you are sincere in your opposition, substantiate your objections by arguments addressed to the understanding, rather than by suggestions which you are unwilling to avow before a tribunal proper to try their merits.

As you have been indulged by the judges to offer your plea, in "*oppugnation*" to a jurisdiction, which *they had legalized* by all the usual forms attending our courts of judicature, it is expected, after you have thus abruptly abandoned the ground, that this authority will not suffer itself to be retarded by any further proceedings of a similar nature. They will not hazard the tranquillity of the country to gratify the resentment of a few disappointed partizans.

After your formal parade in offering your plea and exciting the attention of the public, to stumble at the threshold, and shrink from the arduous undertaking, must lessen you in the estimation even of those who have heretofore appreciated your talents. The palladium of justice is not to be violated by rushing precipitately into its sanctuary, and in a wanton manner to prostrate its attri-

butes. When a man contemplates so important a transaction, it is incumbent on him to pause and deliberate with the most solemn circumspection, before he ventures even to suggest his intentions ; he should reflect on the consequences before he agitates the question, and not afterwards become terrified at the magnitude and danger of his propositions.

I will venture to inquire of you, sir, if such a procedure, (analagous in all its points) had taken place in England, whether it would have passed over without a severe reprimand from the bench ? The prudence and moderation of the judges, in the present state of politics, it is candidly supposed was the only cause which prevented a similar reprehension. I am not for abridging the privileges of the citizens in their appeals to the judiciary, but I must repeat, that when a man enters the *sanctum sanctorum* of justice, with a solemn remonstrance against its jurisdiction, it is incumbent on him to consider maturely the ground of his objections, and the *consequences arising from them*, before he ventures to disturb the harmony of the system. It is but a poor apology, sir, that you reflected afterwards more seriously on the subject, as the time to consider the plea was of much longer duration previous to your entering it, than the hour assigned to argue it. I am willing to admit your apology, but must hold to my first position, that your conduct was *indiscreet* and *indecent*. You may think, sir, to evade an answer with as much indifference as you abandoned *your plea*, but depend on it your *over-rated* talents will not screen you from further animadversions.

---

No. LXXII.

TO THEOPHILUS PARSONS, ESQ.

THE mortification which you have suffered, in not being able to support your plea, may be an apology for not noticing the remarks made in my last Number. This, however, is but a feeble

excuse for a man, who has ventured to arrest a Court of Justice in its legal operations. If you do not answer, your cause goes by *default*; and you stand convicted, before an impartial public, of attempting that which you could not substantiate, and of retreating from a controversy on which your professional talents were pledged.

Your reputation, as a lawyer, had arisen to the highest elevation; but "there is a tide in the affairs of men." You have been suffered to sport with the character you had acquired, and have at length by your temerity brought yourself to that standard, which is the only "check and balance" to an unbounded vanity and ambition. You vainly thought that your plea was sufficient to convince the people of the unconstitutionality of the court, without reflecting that it would excite on the next day, the curiosity of a crowded audience, to hear the arguments urged in defence of the ground which you had presumptuously occupied. Your nerves, it is probable, were strung at the moment of your appeal, to an uncommon tone of energy; but a few hours of more deliberate reflection had relaxed them to that state of debility, which palsied those efforts adequate to the magnitude of the undertaking.

I would wish, sir, to reason coolly on this interesting subject. I would ask you, whether your plea was not a direct impeachment either of the integrity or legal knowledge of the judges? The court was opened and formally organized; prayers were made to heaven to solemnize its proceedings; the marshal, constables, and every subordinate officer, were pursuing their usual routine of business:—Was it not then the highest act of impropriety to state a plea which struck at the constituted authority of the United States, thus solemnly and formally moving within its judiciary orbit?—What was the language of your plea? Was it not to this purport? 'May it please your Honours, *I, Theophilus Parsons*, come forward, clothed with the majesty of my own pre-eminence, to inform the court, that they do not know the duties of their office; although they have taken an oath to support the constitution of the United States, yet they are acting in violation of it; that they are pursuing measures which expose them to an impeachment; that they are ignorant of the laws which they presume to execute; that the prayer of the clergyman on opening the court, is a libel against the government, and an affront to heaven; that the jury are only

aiders and abettors of treason and rebellion ; and, that your marshals and constables are in league with a body of insurgents, who have assembled in this hallowed place of justice to prostrate all the sacred attributes of the judiciary—I, therefore propose, at 10 o'clock to-morrow, to convince your Honours of the legality of my charge ; and, if you are honest men, you will dissolve the court, and retire to your homes, under a full conviction of the indecency and impropriety of your conduct !

This, sir, appears to me to be the plain language of your plea ; and after you had thus come forward, I must declare as my opinion, that the court *ought* to have held you to prove your charge, or obliged you to *ask pardon* for your presumption.

I would ask you, sir, whether you had fully considered the *consequences* of your conduct ?—Suppose a vessel had sailed for Europe on the day you offered your plea, and it was announced in England, France, Holland, Russia, and other commercial nations, that the courts of justice were about to be stopped in America—do you know, sir, what effect this might have had on the commerce of this country ? Would an English, Dutch or Russian merchant ship goods, while the courts of law were thus suspended ? Would not every European merchant have been cautious how far he answered the orders of his correspondents ? Would not a general distrust have arisen on the Exchange of these respective nations ? Would not an universal dread have been stamped on all mercantile concerns, as they related to the United States ? especially, if it was asserted that the *giant of the law* had thus arrested the courts of justice, and had only required a few hours to complete the dissolution ? Thus the strength of your talents proves the weakness of your conduct.

As a lawyer, you may think to trifle *within the bar*, but remember, sir, that what is sport to you, is death to the character of the country. The property of the merchant, in his foreign connexions, is of the most sacred nature. You ought also to be reminded, that the commerce of America is deposited in almost every port of the habitable world, and that your *visionary speculations* may eventually ruin thousands of enterprising merchants and industrious seamen. I am free to say, that I think every man who was concerned in navigation, and whose vessel sailed on the day in which you stopped the Court, is entitled to an action of damage,

for your wanton, injudicious, and unprecedented proceedings, and if I was on the jury, should insist on laying a heavy penalty.

Further—did you consider how far such a proceeding might have operated on the *public credit* of the United States? The nations, to whom we are indebted, might have made immediate demands on us, when they apprehended a dissolution of our Judiciary. The public funds must have fallen in foreign markets, and the merchants in general been exposed to all those inconveniences arising from a *decrease of confidence* in our judiciary tribunals. In short, sir, you are not aware of the mischiefs which might have taken place by your indiscretion, not only as it relates to individuals, but to the whole nation. I am willing to allow you every indulgence for your hasty measure, but while the dignity and reputation of America are hazarded by your imprudence, / it is incumbent on every citizen to reprobate your folly.

I would call on you, sir, to produce an authority, on which you predicated your plea. I do not pretend to be a *drilled lawyer*, shackled with the *formalites* of his profession, but I challenge you to state from the books a similar plea. I know that a plea of jurisdiction may be made, as to a particular case, but you will be puzzled to shew any authority analogous to your imperious stride of destroying the existence of a court, in the extensive degree contemplated by you. As an attorney, I ask you to produce the evidence ---you may be silent, but silence is no conviction of the propriety of your behaviour, and when a *lawyer* holds his tongue, it is a strong proof that he is *confounded*. If you do not answer, I must conclude that *Theophilus Parsons, Esquire*, is destitute of *reasons* to vindicate his conduct.

I would not be too severe in my remarks, or attempt to draw an unfair conclusion from the premises; but when we consider the *revolutionary tendency* of the measure; the consequences which must inevitably have taken place, in case the plea had been admitted; the total derangement of all causes in which property was depending; the general convulsion in every department of government, by a war commencing between the legislature and judiciary; in short, the laws suspended; life, liberty and property tossed on the boisterous ocean of contending parties; the sword of justice arrested, and the poignard of an Essex junto introduced as a substitute—amidst this contention, who, sir, could answer for the dreadful state

into which society would be plunged? You must have been responsible for the event, and "God only knows" the extent of the catastrophe. Viewing things on this broad scale, no citizen who duly estimates the harmony of the United States will consider the above observations as too pungent. I flatter myself that your candour and good sense will suppose them but a *moderate discipline* for the evil which you threatened.

---

## No. LXXIII.

### BILLY DAPPER AND CHARLES STEADY.

IN the progress of *federalism*, every *passion* of the human mind has been assailed; interest, fear and pride have been the bulwarks more immediately exposed to the attack of the enemy. The *young men* of all ranks in society have been arrested by the federal party; the weight of pecuniary influence has threatened them with poverty, and in many instances with the ruin of themselves and families. How often have we seen the overbearing spirit of a rich despot, exercised on the days of election—and it is known as a fact, that many *tradesmen* were explicitly told, at the time the *British treaty* was in agitation, if they did not sign in favour of its adoption, that every means would be taken to deprive them of the employment of *federalists*. Even since the *last election*, certain *petty tyrants* have refused to employ some *independent mechanics*, because they exercised their right of suffrage as *conscience* dictated, when they had ever fulfilled their engagements with undoubted honesty and fidelity.

But the most powerful and artful method pursued was exciting a kind of *fashionable currency* to the politics of the day. Those who presumptuously styled themselves the "better sort" introduced a cant phraseology of *federal* and *jacobin*. *Federalism* was as fashionable as a *spencer* or *pantaloons*—in all those *refined circles*, federalism was the card of invitation or introduction;

which admitted the respective guests—"Mr. Such-a-one, a *federalist*," was the common passport which ushered him into these polite associations. Masters and misses were taught to reverence and respect all those who were complimented with this appellation; young *gentlemen* and young *ladies* were noticed by their respective *mammas* and *papas* in proportion as they gave evidences of their *federal inclination*.

*Billy Dapper* was a federalist, and *Charles Steady* a jacobin; the former was received with every mark of cordiality, while the latter was reprobated as the most abandoned profligate. *Billy* would talk with a peculiar flippancy about politics, and lament the progress of infidelity; he would repeat with rapid volubility, *d—n the jacobins, d—n the disorganizers, d—n the deists, d—n a republican government*, and generally concluded his pious rhapsody with *d—n Tom Paine!* He was a prodigy of perfection, and every thing *Billy* said was considered *monstrously* wise and *wonderfully* profound; he gained such an ascendancy that all he proposed was adopted, and many deep speculations were made in consequence of his sage recommendations. His notes were readily endorsed, and *Billy* had only to ask and receive; he pursued his plans, and increased in reputation to the amount of about 100,000 dollars. At length his affairs began to grow a "little squally;" his "checks" on the bank were all "balanced;" and finally he had no other resource than to betake himself to the *place of refuge* in "Scollay's buildings," and there, like many of his predecessors, enriched himself by impoverishing his creditors; thereby cancelling all debts, dues and demands by a *noli prosequi* of "*sit transit gloria mundi*." *Billy Dapper* after thus legally and honourably disincumbering himself from the rude assaults of impertinent *dunners* and more insolent *bailiffs*, strutted about with a dignified deportment; took new apartments, decorated them with fashionable furniture, and commenced *gentleman* under the "modern philosophy" of the bankrupt-act. He now renews his old language; *d—ns the jacobins, d—ns the president*, and is peculiarly energetic in anathematizing *Tom Paine the infidel*. He is greatly concerned for the cause of religion, and laments the consequences of demoralizing the rising generation; he will often exclaim,—what will become of society when men are not held to do justice by *moral obligation!* But *Billy* is a federalist; he has assumed his credit, goes on in his business, and even now looks

down with ineffable contempt on *Charles Steady*.—During the *reign of terror*, Billy and his comrades were outrageous against every man who dared to think different from them ; the card-table would sometimes be disturbed by their vociferations ; even the tranquil game of whist would be thrown into confusion ; all the *honours* would oftentimes be lost, and the *tricks* would be the only part of the game to count upon.

Thus much for the history of *Billy Dapper*—but, alas, *Charles Steady* was peculiarly unfortunate under his political denunciation. He had received a collegiate education, and was well instructed in the principles of honesty and economy ; he had not only applied himself to his profession, but had appropriated his leisure hours to reading history, and from thence had been able to judge with propriety of those systems of government which secured the rights of the people ; he knew the baneful effects of monarchy, the destructive tendency of aristocracy, and had from reflection approved a republican form as most congenial to his country. Knowing that economy was the basis of this government, he always reprobated those expenditures and establishments under the former administration, which led to a subversion of the purity of its principles. In the reign of terror, therefore, he had the resolution not to wear a *cockade* ; he exploded the idea of a standing army ; he did not approve of excise laws or stamp-acts, and thought it was an imposition for Mr. Adams to allow eight per cent. for the loan of money when all the federalists had pledged their lives and *property* in support of his measures. He would often say, why did Mr. Adams thus sport away the public credit in giving such excessive usury, when he had the strongest assurances from the addresses of the federalists, that their property was at his disposal ? *Charles*, by this kind of conversation, and by adhering to these principles, was early denounced in all circles of his acquaintance as a *jacobin* ; the young *gentlemen* forsook him, the young *ladies* eyed him askant ; even when he entered into company, it was quickly whispered that he was a *jacobin* ; if any parties were proposed in his presence, it was soon hushed till *Charles* had retired—No *gentleman* would be seen abroad in his company ; no *lady* would condescend to *ride with him*, none to walk with him, none to talk with him, none to *curtsey* to him, even if he submissively bowed to them ;—alas, poor *Charles* was forsaken by all his former acquaintance ; and even



the young ladies who always before were pleased with him, took a strong aversion, and he was left alone to wander about like Rachel mourning for her first-born.

However, *Charles* adhered to his principles, and pursued his occupation with industry. He got forward in opposition to the vile means of his enemies to injure his reputation; he formed a character by his scientific acquirements; his credit was established by the rectitude of his conduct; his notes were never hawked upon the exchange at a discount; he baffled his opponents by the uniformity of his principles, and now stands in that elevated situation, as it relates to property and honour, that his enemies envy him. He is not disturbed by the cries of the injured widow and orphans; he walks through the streets without the curses of honest creditors; and when he passes, no man can say, *there goes a villain!* He does not carry the bankrupt-act as a passport, or a "WHEREAS" as a receipt in full for all delinquencies; his payments are twenty shillings in the pound, and what he eats, drinks and wears are not the earnings of other men's industry. He does not make religion a cloak for licentiousness, or curse Tom Paine for a mask to cheat an indiscreet tradesman; he esteems honest men, let their religious professions be what they may, and never embraces a hypocrite to gain an advantage by his sycophancy; he speaks his mind on all proper occasions with the sincerity of a freeman, and scorns to flatter, though he might obtain the approbation of the powerful; he remains collected in the various changes of parties, and steady to his purpose when he is threatened with the frowns of the opulent; an approving conscience raises him above fear, and all his actions are the result of a deliberation, founded on the basis of inviolable integrity. He never smiles to betray the innocent, or frowns to dismay the timid; he inculcates Christianity to promote charity and philanthropy, but despises the man who makes the benevolence of the Deity a scourge to inflict the mischief rankling within his own bosom; his practice and his profession in every respect correspond; he is not a saint in words, and a fiend in deeds.

Thus stand in general the characters of these two men, and thus have they proceeded in their respective intercourse with society. To avoid as much as possible, personalities, they are not so

particularly described as to designate any individual. One, however, has been covered with the mantle of *federalism*, which, like charity, hides a multitude of sins; while the other has been obliged to exercise all his virtues, to screen himself from the malignant disposition of his adversaries—while one revelled in luxury and dissipation, imposed on the credulous and defrauded the unsuspecting, the other was beset with all the venom of malice, and his character rendered the sport of every unprincipled man who had enrolled his name in the federal catalogue. “Such things have been,” but we trust in God that the time is arrived, when characters will be estimated, not by the phraseology of party, but by the standard of honour and honesty; that imperious lordlings who have acquired fortunes by the necromancy of speculation; despots who exercise an insolent control over the tradesman and labourer; and fanatics who wish to shackle the reason of mankind, will be brought to that ‘check and balance’ which gives them no other pre-eminence than what arises from their inherent merit. When this takes place, the hypocrite will be stripped of his plumage, the purse-proud speculator of his trappings, and spurious federalism appear in that deformity to which its advocates have long since reduced it.

## No. LXXIV.

### THE WIDOW'S MITE.

TEXT—“*And he called unto him his disciples, and sayeth, verily I say unto you, that this poor Widow hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the Treasury.*—Mark xi. 43d.

THE scripture is profitable for all things; it contains doctrines which are applicable both to civil and religious institutions. Our Saviour took cognizance of all transactions, and always made his observations with a view to inculcate social and divine precepts.

After cautioning his hearers against those "who love to go in long clothing, and salutations in the market-place, the chief seats in the synagogue, the uppermost seats at feasts ; who devoured widows' houses, and for a pretence made long prayers : " At this moment of exhortation, he sat over against the Treasury, and beheld many that "were rich cast in much" ; but amidst this general exhibition of public munificence, he descried a poor woman putting in her mite, which so far arrested his attention as immediately led him to notice the promptitude with which she paid her exactions.

This casting into the treasury, it is conjectured, was a tax upon the Jews, for the support of their ecclesiastical institutions ; as we cannot suppose that either the rich or the poor were at that day disposing of their money in a wanton manner, without some call from the government. The rich Scribes and Pharisees, it is probable, took occasion in the presence of our Saviour, to shew their alacrity in paying tythes of all they possessed, and deposited of their abundance, the full amount of their taxes. They thought it would confound him, while reprobating those who made a boast of their sanctity, to see with what readiness they placed their assessed quota into the treasury. It is probable, they expected the multitude and his disciples would have rose in opposition to his denunciation, when the evidence was so clearly before their eyes, of the sincerity of their professions. No doubt some men in long clothing, who had devoured many a widow's house, took occasion to make a great parade around the treasurer's office, in order to attract the attention of the bye-standers—they expected to hear the people cry out, these are the "men of order" ! these are the men of "steady habits" ! these are those who support church and state ! these are the charitable actions of those whom ye have thus calumniated ! Behold their sincerity ! see with what cheerfulness they cast in their riches ! Can any doubt their attachment to the rights, liberties and happiness of the people ? As to this poor widow, she only casts in a mite, while they are obliged to enrich the treasury with the greatest abundance.

This mode of reasoning was very natural for men who considered things in this contracted point of view ; but our Saviour reflected on this event in a different manner. He never made an observation without an explicit meaning ; he considered the subject, as it related to the circumstances of society, and the *inequality*

of taxes. He knew that the abundance of the rich was not in proportion to the widow's mite ; and when he saw that her tax was the greatest part of her whole property, he could not but remark to his disciples on the disproportion of the burthen. His whole ministration was solely calculated to relieve the bowed down, and when he observed in this general deposit into the treasury, that though the rich seemed to bear a large proportion of the public expenses, yet as it related to the property possessed, the poor had the heaviest weight in discharging the public debt. The treasurer, it is expected, even smiled at the poor widow, when she threw in her mite ; and provided the old lady had made any complaint of her tax, she would have been considered as a disorganizer, and sent to the house of correction ; neither is it improbable that our Saviour was denounced as a stirrer up of sedition, for drawing any parallel between the widow and the rich men who accompanied her. At that day they held in small repute the taxes of the middling classes of citizens ; they thought their aid in society was of but little consideration ; without reflecting, that while others gave of their abundance, the poor man paid a greater proportion of his actual possessions.

These reflections naturally lead us to notice the observations made by those who oppose the repeal of the excise and other internal taxes. They say the rich pay them, and that the poor are not injured by their operation. While considering this question, we will not confine ourselves to the poor, in the idea generally affixed to this appellation ; but we will, in connexion with them, bring into view the *middling interest*, consisting of farmers, tradesmen and labourers. When we offer these classes as the criterion on which to judge, we must conclude, that they pay more taxes by excise, than those generally denominated the rich ; and though the high-toned federalists pretend to justify this mode of taxation, as falling exclusively on the wealthy, yet on an accurate examination we shall find they fall heavily on the poor and middling interest.

The excise, as it relates to many rich men, is principally on the consumption of such articles as they are called on to furnish more generally from inclination or accident, than necessity. For the most part, they are men who live on the income of their public stocks and bank dividends. The excise which they pay is either to

please their own appetites, or to entertain their bacchanalian associates, on some peculiar festive occasions. All they pay is a voluntary tax, and as the revenue is increased by the sums raised on the community at large, they are enabled to receive their quarterly dividends with more punctuality. They are in favour of an excise upon a general principle, that if they pay 6*s.* duty in the course of the year, they are sure of receiving from the treasury the full interest on their funds at 2*s.*

But the case stands different with others, who may be denominated the middling interest. The farmer, in consequence of an excise, is brought into an expense which is a direct tax on his produce, and which he cannot avoid. It is not merely to please his appetite, neither does he receive any immediate advantages resulting from the revenue. The supplies of spirituous liquors to the workmen and labourers upon his farm, are an extra expense which he is *necessitated* to pay ; every glass of liquor is burdened with a duty, which lessens the profits on his produce. In haying-time, he is obliged to employ a great number of labourers ; in the several busy seasons, he has a great addition to his family, and their maintenance includes many articles on which an excise is laid. In most instances, the farmer, by this mode of taxation, has to pay a larger amount to the government, than many men who have from one hundred thousand to five hundred thousand dollars in the public funds.

The case is somewhat similar with the tradesman, as he is obliged to employ many journeymen in his occupation, and wages are generally given in proportion to the prices on certain particular articles ; the number of apprentices usually taken by this class of citizens, involve in it a heavy tax from this species of revenue. Even the merchant is subject to a disproportionate weight of government from this cause ; as the employment of his clerks and labourers is attached with an expense arising from this source. The old soldier, who disposed of the evidences of his patriotism during our conflict with Britain, most assuredly must feel the weight of a tax, which falls on the cheering cordial that refreshes him amidst the toils and fatigues of the day ; his mite comes heavily, when he reflects that these are the rewards of his services. He *now* drinks his grog with a merry heart, and blesses the administration that has removed the bitter ingredient of an excise.

When, therefore, we hear the federalists exclaiming that the *excise* was principally paid by the rich, and that it was an imposition on the poor to repeal it, the fallacy of such reasoning is evident from a more accurate consideration of the subject. For I believe we may venture to assert, that the middling interest, including the labouring poor, pay four times their just quota by this mode of taxation more than the richest classes in society. These small duties are a constant draining from their hard-earned property, and though the rich apparently cast into the treasury much of their abundance, yet, like the poor widow, the farmer, tradesman and labourer pay in "more than they all."

The repeal of the chaise and carriage-tax is also said to be injurious to the middling interest. They tell us, that the rich nabobs at the southward are the chief supporters of this tax, and that it is only relieving *them* by the repeal. But this reasoning also is vanity. The proportion of carriages among the rich men of this description, is scarcely one to an hundred. In this town, we have about fifty such carriages, but through the State, the number of chaises may be reckoned at five thousand; these are generally kept by farmers and tradesmen, not merely for convenience, but their local situation requires it; the distance from meeting-houses in the country, obliges a man to keep this family-carriage to convey his wife and children to divine service; to take a ride to the sea-port on business; and probably to pay interest on a note in the bank, or in the hands of one of these rich men, who so greatly bemoan the repeal of the tax. A chaise therefore cannot be called a luxury, but a necessary article in most families in the country. To apply these remarks to my text, the duty on five thousand carriages is a revenue which arises principally from the middling classes; and if they do not, like the widow, pay into the treasury all they have, yet they cast in more in proportion to the property they possess, than the fifty who appear to deposit so largely from their abundance. Can any person think it reasonable, that a hackman, whose carriage is his only means of maintenance, should pay the same tax on this article as the man who keeps a pleasurable-carriage, and has an income of ten thousand dollars to support it?

It is singular, that those who style themselves federalists ever pretend to be led by gospel principles, and are so devout as to in-

corporate religion with their politics; they claim an exclusive character for attachment to the Christian system; yet there is no book extant, which so completely counteracts their political tenets. Our Saviour seemed to seek occasion to reprobate all those who made a trade of their piety; his sermon on the mount, and every remark he made, were peculiarly levelled at those bodies who exercised sovereignty over the people from their pre-eminent sanctity, or pretended to *render to Cæsar more than others*. Is it not remarkable, that our Saviour should espie a widow with her mite, amidst the crouds who surrounded the treasury; that he should call his disciples to him, and so minutely state the quantity she had given in; that he should over-look with indifference the large sums paid by the rich, and select a poor woman as the object of his notice, who was the least regarded by the money-holders who accompanied her? He did not make his observations indiscriminately to his audience; as he knew the prejudices of the people in favour of those who made great professions of their liberality towards religious and civil institutions; but he called his disciples *unto him*, and *privately* gave them a hint, to beware of hypocrites, and instilled into them, as a radical principle, that the poor or middling interest always paid their full proportion of the public taxes. This being a day to pay *into the treasury*, and having an opportunity to see the process of the business, he took occasion to give this lecture to his disciples; but if he had seen the group who probably the next day went to *receive their demands*, possibly, he would have been as particular in designating some individuals for the quantity they received, in proportion to the sum they had paid, as he was in describing the widow and her small pittance.

To conclude, the foregoing remarks are not intended to make an invidious distinction between the rich and the poor. In society the former are to be respected, and the latter regarded. A levelling principle is not the object contemplated, but that each individual should feel his just weight in the community. The observations are made to check the arrogance of a certain "sect," who pretend to claim an exclusive privilege from their property; who endeavour to depreciate those who are not possessed so largely of this world's goods as themselves; who claim all the religion, all the knowledge, all the patriotism of the country, and who despise

the poor, for their mite towards the support of government. But our Saviour has given them a good lesson, which the present administration is endeavouring to follow, and which we are persuaded will be approved by heaven. The impost being adequate to all the purposes of government, under the economical system adopted, the merchant, tradesman, farmer, war-worn soldier, or the poor widow, are not required *needlessly* to pay even a *mite* into the treasury.

## No. LXXV.

### REVIEW OF "OLD TIMES."

SEVENTY-FIVE, in the seventeenth century, is a prominent number in the American calendar ; it is emphatically designated "the time which tried men's souls" ; it is the period of the American revolution, which called forth all the energies of patriotism, valour and decision. The man who halted between two opinions, at this crisis, was justly considered an enemy to his country. America then assumed the attitude of an injured and determined nation. Britain avowed the principle, and pursued measures to carry into execution the detestable declaration, to "bind us in all cases whatever." This veto was attempted to be enforced by the *laws of the bayonet*, and the citizens of America had no other alternative than to decide between SLAVERY and FREEDOM.

In this contest, *liberty or death* was the motto—"Uniting we stand, dividing we fall," was the creed to which every real friend to his country subscribed. The *tories* took one side of the question, and the *whigs* the other ; one party assisted the British, and the other opposed them. The Boston town-meetings were an epitome of the controversy between Britain and America. Fellow-citizens, ye who remember the contest, recollect the debates in your solemn assemblies ; bring to mind the crowded audiences, who with anxious concern attended to the deliberations of your intrepid patriots. Can ye forget the machinations of your enemies or the subtle



designs of Hutchinson and his adherents? Were not your liberties suspended on the intrepidity of your determinations, and were not a body of tories assailing you in every direction? If you had *then* been afraid to espouse your rights, they would have fallen a sacrifice to your timidity. Recollect the *horn-buck faction*, who intermixed themselves among the *sons of liberty*; the soldiery who were sent to intimidate the citizens during their freedom of debate and investigation. Our souls were then "invigorated with the spirit of liberty;" *Faneuil-Hall* bore testimony that men were superior to "wolves"; the decisions of the town of Boston gave ample evidence that the liberty of brutes, and the unalienable rights of freemen, were not analogous. No *real* American at this period contemplated the derogatory connexion between the voracious animals of the desert, and the deliberate sentiments of citizens. Even at this period, when the revolution of America was in swaddling clothes, when the independence of our country had scarcely formed its features in embryo, no one was hardy enough to draw a parallel between *our exertions for liberty*, and the *savage disposition* of wolves in the forest!

This period reminds us of that sanguinary scene, when the streets of Boston were crimsoned with the blood of its citizens! The horrid massacre on the night of *March the 5th 1770*, is a lesson which ought to impress on the minds of Americans the hostile disposition of Britain. Can any friendship exist in a nation, whose soldiery spread indiscriminate slaughter among the inhabitants of this metropolis? Can the *old whigs* forget the distressing scene when the corps of five of their fellow-citizens were followed in solemn procession through the streets of Boston? When the *tories* were rejoicing at the sanguinary catastrophe, and only bewailed the misfortune that Samuel Adams and John Hancock were not the objects of general lamentation. The *whigs* well remember the town-meeting at the *Old-South* the succeeding day; the assembly of citizens was august and impressive; the debates were forcible and decisive; the energies of the inhabitants appeared in their full majesty; one spirit invigorated the whole body, and one tongue expressed their ultimate determination. Can we forget the venerable Samuel Adams on this solemn occasion? Can we forget the fortitude of his mind, or the magnanimity of

his conduct? Do we not even at this day recognize him in the *Old-South pulpit*, while standing as a bulwark to impede the encroachments of the enemy? "How did our hearts burn within us," when he recounted the impositions we had suffered! and how did our souls beat in unison with the sentiments which he inculcated! This was truly the "*time to try men's souls*." VENERABLE PATRIOT! you are now retired from the world to enjoy that composure which your services merit; happy are you in the reflection, that you have never deviated from the road which you early described as the only path of safety and happiness. In your retirement, you have to lament, that *foes* who began the journey with you have strayed into the broad way which leads to destruction; but still your reflections must give consolation to your declining years; and though feeble in body, yet your SOUL must experience those joys which are ever strangers to the breasts of apostates. While others have received the sycophantic addresses of men, who in '75 would have led them to the gibbet, you have enjoyed domestic tranquillity, and have had the satisfaction to reflect, if you was not *flattered*, you was not *despised*; you never became the *dupe* of a party, or the sport of those who made an instrument of your credulity;—firm, manly and decisive, you never was obliged to apologize for your conduct, by laying the blame on those who presumed to dictate through an "expected or unexpected quarter." No—you was a politician equal to your emergencies, and certainly you was placed in a responsible situation, when the most critical precaution was necessary for your judgment. When the *proscription of Britain* entwined you and HANCOCK as victims to satiate their vengeance, even at this momentous crisis, ADAMS and HANCOCK never stooped to become suppliants for ministerial or tory clemency. Your fellow-citizens, *venerable patriot*, will ever embalm your memory with their praise, and your name will never be mentioned without reverting to the magnitude of your virtues, and the pre-eminent testimonies you have given of your unbiassed attachment to their freedom and happiness. YOU HAVE DONE YOUR DUTY, AND NO MAN CAN IMPEACH YOUR FIDELITY.

In this Number, I have chosen to select among the variety of circumstances attending the revolution, the *Boston massacre*. This was the touchstone of the English system of taxation. After the troops had arrived in Boston, every method was taken to bring on

a rupture ; they found town-meeting altercations were needless ; their only resort was, *to arms and the shedding of blood* ! The tories always held up to the ministry, that we were poltroons, and that the first man killed would end the controversy. The *fifth of March massacre* was planned upon this derogatory supposition ; the ministry expected, after they had displayed their prowess and evinced their determination, that the citizens of America would have been intimidated from any further opposition ; but when they found that the blood of the Americans operated like oil to the flame, they became dismayed. The firmness of the town of Boston on this occasion, was the basis of the revolution ; this was the trial of principle ; this was putting theory into practice. The conduct of Britain was bringing our town-meeting resolves to the test, and this was the period when the republicans gave an unequivocal evidence of their patriotism. The *tradesmen* of Boston were alert to the cause of their country ; they gave support to the active citizens who pledged their lives and fortunes in vindication of the rights of the people ; they were an irresistible body, and when they moved within the orbit of freedom and rose superior to tory influence, all opposition fell before them. The *tradesmen* were fully informed of the importance of the controversy, and when they spoke, their voice was audible and decisive. The *independent merchants* were not inactive, as we were not baffled at this period with a body of mercantile mushrooms, who live on the smiles of a *British master*, and who dare not act contrary to his dictates. The YEOMANRY also came forward to vindicate their rights as freemen ; this valuable part of the community never failed when their exertions were necessary ; on this independent body we ever did, and ever must rely ; they are the stamina of our government, and the great palladium of our constitutional privileges. The counties of *Middlesex* and *Norfolk*, with others, still retain the horrors of a British banditti, as they well remember the sanguinary onset of a mercenary soldiery on the commencement of hostilities. The 19TH OF APRIL, 1775, will impress on their minds the dreadful effects of monarchy and toryism. *Lexington* was a *telegraph*, which conveyed the intelligence to the remotest parts of the continent—like the *star in the east*, mentioned in scripture, it directed Washington to the spot, where the camp of America was formed, to effect the salvation of freemen. From this moment the Americans were

alive to their situation, and nothing short of heaven could have inspired them with their martial intrepidity, valour and prowess ; unprepared with every warlike implement, they were obliged to seek powder from the very earth under their ancient buildings, and, like the dust of Egypt by the wand of Aaron, it was converted to the purpose of annoying and distressing their enemies.

I have particularly selected, as is before observed, the subject of the *Boston massacre*. When this took place, the controversy in this country involved in it the right of the British government to tax America ; they sent troops to enforce it. In this state of things, could any patriot justify, for a *trifling fee*, the indiscriminate slaughter of his fellow-citizens, merely from the unruly conduct of a number of boys ? Edward Paine, Esq. a worthy citizen, was wounded at his door, and every man, woman and child were more protected by Providence, than the lenity of the murderers.

I would not dwell too long on this circumstance, relating to the advocate for Preston, as I believe the suggestion is sufficient to convince him of the impropriety of his conduct. Whether the main guard of British troops should dispense the laws, in a country where their *whole authority was disputed*, was the question on which Preston and his associates ought to have been tried.

The controversy had gone beyond the trifling consideration of a lawyer's fee ; the important question of civil and military boundary was to be ascertained, and when a patriot became the advocate for a prompt decision of powder and ball (without even the formality of a justice of the peace) the British naturally concluded that a few guineas would silence our clamours, and bring our leading characters to justify their measures.

The political state of our country requires us to look back, in order to take some line of departure, by which we may draw our decisions. The fifth of March massacre, in my opinion, is the era which decided characters, within the town of Boston, in the estimation of Britain. They never forgave Samuel Adams or John Hancock for insisting on the removal of the troops ; English pride rose indignant at the action ; this was the unpardonable sin, which led to their proscription—but while they thirsted for the blood of these patriots, gratitude ever induced them to respect those who countenanced a venal court to release the murderers. At this

moment, the hand-writing was discovered "*Mene Tekel Upharsin*," which is thus interpreted,—he who vindicates the murderers of his townsmen is found wanting in patriotism.

---

*The following pieces were written, in the year 1797, by the same author ;—and as they contain principles and documents connected with the foregoing Numbers, they are inserted for the perusal of the citizens.*

#### LAND-TAX, &c.

THE statement of the treasury-department, for further supplies of revenue, is a subject which could scarcely be contemplated a few years back. The IMPOST was, in the first instance, considered as adequate to all the exigences of government ; and in fact was declared so vastly competent to all the purposes, that a declaration was made by secretary Hamilton that an overplus remained in the treasury. Notwithstanding this pleasing representation, we were soon called upon for an EXCISE, which was predicated on the principle that the WAR-DEPARTMENT required this additional duty. These two taxes have been for many years in full operation, and though we have been told of the "flourishing situation of our commerce," (of consequence the revenue arising must have been greatly augmented) yet, even with this brilliant prospect of a *decrease of taxation*, we have now presented to us a gloomy statement, that the revenue is incompetent to our governmental demands. A LAND-TAX is now the resort, and is to become the medium for further supplies. The merchant and tradesman have hitherto experienced largely the demands of government ; and the FARMER is now to be brought forward to assist the revenue. Though the yeomanry have heretofore in an indirect way bore their proportion of the weight of impost and excise, yet they are now called upon for an immediate taxation on their lands.

It is possible that the necessities of our government may require an increase of revenue, but we certainly ought to know by what fatality, we are reduced to this necessity. We ought to be informed of the expenditures, and through what channels the excess of duties have been absorbed. If the departments of government have hitherto been too lavish of the public money ; If the WAR DEPARTMENT has sunk millions, by "mis-management and neglect ;" If the BRITISH TARIFF brings into view a large debt to be discharged by the United States : If the building of frigates, will absorb millions to complete them : If we have hitherto been lavish in consequence of the facility of collecting the revenue :— If these things are true, it is proper that the people should be made acquainted with these circumstances, before they resign the great stamina of Taxation, the LANDS of the United States.

No individual within the United States ever conceived that the subject of a LAND-TAX would have been before Congress at so early a period after the adoption of the federal constitution. We have often heard that we were *lessening* our debts ; that the revenue was adequate ; and the "flourishing state of our commerce," gave vigour to these happy ideas. But these luminous prospects have become clouded, and the citizens, in a *time of peace*, are reduced in their financiering arrangements, to a WAR establishment.

Congress it is expected will consider with attention this new revenue proposition ; for if the landed property is once touched, the future system of finance is opened upon an extensive scale ; when this resource (which was ever considered the last) is broke in upon, in a *time of peace*, and should the United States be hereafter engaged in a war, the extent of its operation, and the yearly increase of tax on this source, will reduce the country to a state, but little short of the most fervile nation in Europe.

If, within a few years, we have gone so greatly beyond our resources of impost and excise ; if we have become so lavish on these two objects, as to expend all the production from them, have we not reason to suppose that the call for ONE MILLION, FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FOUR THOUSAND DOLLARS on the land will be as quickly expended ? When the government can once *stop this hobby-horse*, with a weight of *one penny* on an acre, they will soon make it *test* with a weight of *twenty shillings*.

ECONOMY in our expenditures is the great object of attention. Commerce is already burthened. Manufactures are in general either ruined or embarrassed. The revenue arising from impost and excise, (especially the last two years) it is probable would have been adequate to our purposes, if the money had been *economically* appropriated. But when we find, that the expenditures in those transactions which immediately come within our knowledge, are lavished to an unparalleled excess, we have reason to suspect that *economy* has not been the standard of our conduct.

The building of our three frigates, it is expected, will cost more money than three times the same number in any part of Europe. This business may serve to put some men in pay, who otherwise would be out of employ ; it may serve to give exclusive advantages to individuals in furnishing the manufacturing materials ; it may conduce to political purposes, by employing particular men in all the lucrative parts of this naval transaction. But if it is *absolutely necessary* that we should have a navy, of THREE frigates, the business should be so equally proportioned, that no one individual should monopolize in his *manufacturing department*, the advantages of it.

Congress, previous to their granting a land-tax, it is presumed, will call for official documents, to ascertain precisely the expenditures of the enormous sum raised by impost and excise, and will not hastily break in upon the dernier resort of TERRA FIRMA till "The People" are convinced of the propriety, necessity and *economy* of the measure.

## FREE SHIPS, FREE GOODS.

*Fellow-Citizens,*

THE dispute between France and this country has got so far involved in perplexity, that the real objects of controversy are almost thrown out of public view.

The cause of complaint is simply this, the treaty which the United States have made with France, has secured to us the im-

portant privilege of the CARRYING-TRADE, by making free ships free goods. By this treaty, the commerce of this country, as it respects that nation, has the most ample security for a *free trade*, even in time of war. The great difficulty, then, arising between France and this country, is, that by the British treaty *we have expressly stipulated with England* that free ships *shall not* make free goods.

In consequence of this stipulation, the *French property* on board American ships is subject to capture by the British, while the *English property* on board American ships is to remain free and unmolested. France complains of this inequality of privilege, more especially as this is admitted, *on our part*, by an express agreement in the treaty with England.

Let then the Americans judge with respect to the propriety and justness of this partiality. I am sensible, that the plea made by the advocates for the British treaty is, that England never acknowledged the principle, and never would accede to the terms of admitting free ships to make free goods. But though this observation may be plead by Britain, yet the question naturally arises, whether it was good faith in the government of the United States *voluntarily* to make a treaty with England, in direct opposition to the principle on which their treaties with France and Spain were founded? If Britain would not consent to the freedom of our navigation, was it politic or generous in us to grant them *by treaty* the *right* to capture the property of those who had generously acceded to the principle?

Suppose two men had made an agreement to give *free course* to the trade of each other, and a third was so refractory as never to consent to it. In this case, would it not be the highest violation of the right of one, if the other should enter *voluntarily into an agreement* with him who would not recognize the privilege, to check and embarrass the trade of the man with whom he had made his first covenant?

The controversy with France and the United States stands on the same ground of equity. It is true, that nation does not dispute the *right of England*, in not agreeing that free ships should make free goods; neither do they dispute *our right* to make a treaty with them, for this purpose. But at the same time, while



the *right* is acknowledged on our side, if we improve it to their injury, *they also have a right* to resent our ingratitude and duplicity. If we have inconsiderately and wantonly exercised our right in making a treaty with their implacable enemies, and thereby given them advantages which destroy the *mutual benefits* contemplated in our former contract, they have the same right to resent our conduct as we have to make a treaty with Britain to their injury.

The people of America have been deceived by the frequent attempts to persuade them, that France wishes to interfere in our right to make treaties. This, however, is false. France has never denied us this right. But if we are so imprudent as to make a treaty, which subjects French property to be taken on board American vessels, when at the same time, they are under engagements to us, that English property shall be secure in such bottoms, the operation becomes so excessively unjust, that we cannot reasonably suppose any nation would tamely place themselves in such a derogatory and unfavourable situation.

Nations, like individuals, will secure themselves against injustice ; and the only question is, whether the French are wrong in *their resentment*, or we in *giving them the provocation* ?

I have endeavoured to give a *plain statement* of what appears to be one of the essential points of controversy, between France and the United States. The merchants are left to judge of the benefits of a war with those powers, which wish to support the Carrying Trade of the United States in alliance with one which is anxious to annihilate it.

If a war should commence between France and Spain, and America, what are the prospects of our merchants ? Are they willing to join England in this warfare, who are anxious to destroy our Carrying Trade ? Impossible that the good sense of the American merchants should lead them to this excess of Quixotism and individual ruin.

A war with France and Spain is no less than a war upon our own commerce. It is commercial suicide ; and provided the Essex Junto are capable of deceiving the merchants into a compliance with their projects, the only satisfaction they can receive, after the

expenditures of their property, and the ruin of their trade, will be the ridicule of those who are living on the smiles and favoritism of a British party residing in this country.

## ON FOREIGN INFLUENCE.

“*Let us not be Englishmen, nor Frenchmen, but AMERICANS.*”

IN my last, a few observations were made on this *convenient saying*, of certain *time-serving* sycophants. I therein endeavoured to prove that we did not act as *Americans* on the question of the treaty, but were wholly under a *British influence*, in acceding (contrary to our previous resolutions) to this baneful and destructive instrument.

I shall now consider this subject upon more general principles, and attempt to shew, that *British influence* pervades this country in a more extensive manner than is generally apprehended.

When we reflect on the number of British factors who reside within the United States—the number of individuals who were enemies to our revolution, and since the peace returned among us—the number of persons who resided in America during our contest with Britain, and who were inimical to our independence—the particular body of merchants, who receive their annual supplies of merchandize from the English merchants and manufacturers—the shopkeepers in the country who are vending these superfluities in the several towns throughout the United States—the fashions and manners which we imbibe from our British connexions : I would candidly ask, whether all these circumstances do not serve to prove that we are under the influence of the *British nation*, by the various operations of these respective interests ? I dare venture to assert that there is not a man who contemplates the subject upon fair and rational principles, but will readily allow, that the influence of the *British* predominates in this country from these respective causes, and that no other *foreign influence* is half so powerful.

I will again inquire with confidence, whether any man can suppose we are under a *French influence*, strong enough to oppose this powerful combination in favour of Britain? Look through our seaports and the inland trading towns, and who are the persons active in our political concerns? Are they *French* or *British* merchants? What species of merchandize are in their stores or shops? Whose fashions do we follow, or whose manners do we adopt; are they *French* or *English*? Even our theatrical entertainments are announced as being acted at Covent-Garden or Drury-Lane, to give a zest to the performance, and we are led to support them in proportion as they have received their plaudit at those ROYAL places of amusement. Let the revilers against French influence produce the channels through which it operates; let them name the body of French merchants, residing in the metropolis or inland towns; let them announce the immense "horde" of French republicans residing among us. We can then judge whether they are in proportion to the numerous clan of British aristocrats, and men who are *openly in favour* of the monarchy of Britain. Let them produce the body of Frenchmen who are active in our elections in any degree equal to those of the British: In short, let them mention any particular as it relates to *foreign influence*, and it can be proved that the *English nation* possesses, and practices it in a fourfold ratio.

After such demonstrations of the predilection of certain persons to Britain; after being convinced that *British attachments* both in trade and in *political sentiments* so greatly predominate, can we seriously say, that *French influence* prevails within the United States? On the contrary, is it not evident, that *British influence* has an uncontrollable sway? Scarcely a HAT (not a *three-cornered one*) which covers the head of an American, but what announces our connexion with their merchants; and the fantastic gewgaws of many of our ladies are the trophies which proclaim our complete resignation to their fashionable influence. The American ladies whose graces and beauty rise superior to any ornaments from Europe, ought to spurn at the idea of becoming subservient to the paltry trumpery of foreign importations.

The manufactures of America are daily falling a sacrifice to our partiality for Britain; while the British manufacturer is in-

creasing in wealth by our importations, the American manufacturer is declining with equal rapidity ; do not our importations operate as a *prohibition* on our own manufactures, and does not the residence of British factors give a superiority over our own merchants ?

While we are talking of foreign influence, let us reflect on our connexion with England. Let us contemplate the numerous avenues by which this is conveyed. It works in every direction, and strengthens in almost every connexion. I would again ask, wherein have the *French* an equal weight ? Let those who are exclaiming against them, produce the evidences of *their* influence ; or let them show any circumstance, which can in any way counteract the forcible operation of the British, not only in their *commercial intercourse*, but in the efficacy of those insidious arts practised by a phalanx of British factors, who reside among us under a deceptive mask of naturalization.

To sum up the whole in a few words, the *British influence* has become a strong and powerful ingredient to poison the republican principles of our citizens, and while they are employing their *tools* to cry down a *French influence*, they are using every base art to effect their own. They know their force in several parts of the United States, and are busily employed to vilify and abuse every character who attempts to disclose their nefarious measures. Not that I am in favour of a French influence, but would control it in every instance ; my real sentiments are, let us be AMERICANS in DEED and in TRUTH.

## CONCLUDING ADDRESS.

[*Never before published.*]

FELLOW-CITIZENS,

AFTER perusing the foregoing Numbers, you will be led to consider the propriety of the principles, and the justness of the reflections.—Here then we are at issue. ARE THE SENTIMENTS RIGHT, OR ARE THEY WRONG? Speak with candour, and decide with that impartiality which characterizes patriots and republicans.

To the young Americans the foregoing remarks may appear erroneous. They have risen on the stage since the fig-tree began to blossom, and fruit was on the vine; since the labour of the olive has not failed, and the fields have yielded their meat; when the flock was not cut off from the fold, and there was herd in the stall. In these halcyon days, they experience the blessings which *their fathers* obtained by their prowess and exertions.

The question now is, by what means has this country arrived to its present eminence? Was it by the friendship of that nation which declared they had a “right to tax us in all cases whatever”? Did the ravages of their troops give fruitfulness to our fields, or did the blood they shed enrich the soil which feeds the cattle on our “thousand hills”?

I will not affront my countrymen by admitting this idea. If we had been conquered, the wilderness that now blossoms like the rose, would have been the gloomy asylum of persecuted patriots; and these venerable sages would have been hunted in their retirement as partaking of the ferocious liberty of wolves.

Is it policy then, or rather is it not an affront to heaven, to seek an alliance with those who have given such evidences of their enmity? Must we commence war with France and Spain, and then apply to England for assistance, as is proposed by Mr. Morris? Gracious God! “let us pause! for heaven’s sake pause!”

before we precipitate the United States into so hazardous a situation ! Must our country again be stained with blood ? Must the clarion of war be blown through the continent ? Must millions of dollars be appropriated to effect that, which an amicable negotiation will probably cancel ? Surely the President has acted the part of a Christian by attempting a reconciliation : for he who wantonly draws the sword, we are told, will perish by the sword. Not that we should suffer *any nation* to impose on us ; but reason and humanity dictate the path to be taken.

A war with France and Spain, in alliance with England, is the ground-work of the politics of the party in opposition to the present administration. They have, by their artifice, interwoven themselves for a number of years back into our national councils, and the principal part of our troubles have arisen by their agency. They wish to augment the public debt, by establishing systems which lead to extravagant expenditures. They want the government to maintain a body of men at the expense of the industrious merchant, farmer, and tradesman.—This is *genuine federalism* with them, and every thing which has a different tendency is reprobated as *rank jacobinism*.

Are the YOUNG MEN in favour of this policy ? If they are, it must eventually prove their ruin. An expensive government creates burdensome taxes, and the rising generation must feel the weight of their pressure.

This party attempt so far to vitiate the youth, as to render republicanism unfashionable. This is striking at the vitals of our government ; for the man who is not a republican is a POLITICAL ATHEIST, and is as much a subverter of the Constitution as Thomas Paine is an unbeliever in Revelation. All our civil institutions, from the days of our forefathers, are as firmly founded on Republicanism, as the platform of the churches on the Christian religion.

The foregoing observations are not intended to *inflame* the passions, but to *allay* them ; though expressed with *warmth*, they are calculated to bring us to *cool* reflection. In the present state of public affairs, it is requisite to bring into view the many arts and stratagems practised by those who assume the appellation of Federalists, and to shew that all their alarms were the effusions of disaffection, rather than an attachment to the peace and prosperity of

the country. While we revert to the periods when plots and conspiracies were the telegraphs to communicate terror and amazement, and when neighbours assumed an hostile attitude towards each other, how pleasing is the reflection that the cool moment of deliberation has dispelled those clouds which threatened an annihilation of every benign attribute which harmonizes society ! If we find these things false, (which at the time they were propagated gave an impulse to our political conduct) ought we not to distrust those men who create alarms to destroy the confidence of the people in the present administration ? If they have hitherto been false prophets, what reason have we to believe in their future prognostications ?

FELLOW-CITIZENS—In treating on the various subjects in the foregoing Numbers, I have been obliged to vary the mode by argument and satire. Many things have required a serious consideration, while others admitted no other plea than ridicule. I have wholly confined my observations to political considerations, without wishing to reflect on any individual in his moral or social capacity. The GENERAL GOOD is my only object, and I willingly place myself on the candid decisions of my fellow-citizens. I court no *partial patronage*. Having offered my sentiments on the fundamental principles of the Constitution, it will give me satisfaction as a citizen if they are supported ; but if they are not, I feel myself in a situation to meet the evils which await my country. Provided I receive the approbation of the virtuous and patriotic, I shall never concern myself about persons of an opposite character ;

*“ To virtue only, and its friends, a friend,  
The world beside may murmur or commend :  
Know all the distant din this world can keep,  
Rolls o’er my grotto, and but soothes my sleep.”*

FINIS.

---











